R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 853 AC 001 247

PROGRESS AND EVALUATION REPORT, A SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES IN TENNESSEE UNDER TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965. AN HISTORICAL AND EVALUATIVE REPORT OF FISCAL YEAR 1966 AND FISCAL YEAR 1967 PROGRAMS--JULY 1, 1965 TO JUNE 30, 1967.

TENNESSEE UNIV., KNOXVILLE

PUB DATE 3 AUG 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.92 73P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM PROPOSALS, *COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS, *EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, *PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, FINANCIAL SUPPORT, COMMUNITY PROBLEMS, HEALTH SERVICES, LEADERSHIP TRAINING, LOW INCOME GROUPS, URBAN AREAS, FAMILY SERVICES, PROFESSIONAL CONTINUING EDUCATION, INSERVICE EDUCATION, TENNESSEE, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965,

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, DESIGNATED THE STATE AGENCY UNDER TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, HAS ADMINISTERED IN 13 MONTHS MORE THAN HALF A MILLION DOLLARS IN APPROVED PROGRAMS, WHICH PROVIDE CONTINUING EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS TO ADVANCE HIGHER EDUCATION. A 20-MEMBER STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL, COMPOSED OF ACADEMIC, BUSINESS, LABOR, AND CIVIC LEADERS, ASSISTS THE STATE AGENCY IN DEVELOPING AND ADMINISTERING THE TENNESSEE PLAN. THE 21 PROPOSALS FOR 1966 INVOLVED THE PARTICIPATION OF 17 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND 14 PARTICIPATED IN THE 12 1967 PROJECTS. ELEVEN OF THE 1967 PROPOSALS ARE CONTINUATIONS OF THOSE OF 1966. EACH TITLE I PROGRESS AND EVALUATION REPORT INCLUDES A STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM, DESCRIPTIONS OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, ACTIVITIES, IDENTIFICATION, AND STATUS, INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION, AND STATE AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS. PROGRAM EVALUATIONS WERE PREPARED FROM DATA CONTAINED IN THE PROPOSAL FORM, THE NOTICE OF ACTIVATION, AND THE QUARTERLY PROGRESS AND EVALUATION REPORTS WITH THEIR ATTACHMENTS, INCLUDING BROCHURES, PUBLICITY, PROGRAM ROSTERS, AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS. (AJ)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012853

PROGRESS AND EVALUATION REPORT

A Summary of Activities in Tennessee under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Compiled by the

State Agency for Title I

(The University of Tennessee)

and

Presented to the

State Advisory Council

An Historical and Evaluative Report

of Fiscal Year 1966 and Fiscal Year 1967 Programs:

July 1, 1965 to June 30, 1967

August 3, 1967

AC001247

TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965:

ORGANIZATION IN TENNESSEE

State Agency for Title I--The University of Tennessee

Academic Control of the Program

Dr. Herman E. Spivey, Vice President-Academic

Fiscal Control of the Program

Mr. W. Harold Read, Vice President-Finance

Administrative Control of the Program

Dr. James E. Arnold, Dean of University Extension

Dr. Nolen E. Bradley, Director, State Agency

Mr. Paul R. Martin, Jr., Assistant Director, State Agency

State Advisory Council

Chairman

Dr. Hal R. Ramer, Assistant Commissioner, Higher Education, State Department of Education

Other Members

Mr. Herbert J. Bingham, Executive Director, Tennessee Municipal League

Dr. Edward J. Boling, Vice President-Development, The University of Tennessee

Dr. Quill E. Cope, President, Middle Tennessee State University

Dr. W. S. Davis, President, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University

Dr. Everett Derryberry, President, Tennessee Technological University

Dr. C. C. Humphreys, President, Memphis State University

Mr. Robert S. Hutchison, Executive Director, Government-Industry-Law Center, The University of Tennessee

Mr. James H. Jones, Jr., Vice President, First National Bank, Mt. Pleasant, Member, State Board of Education

Mr. Matthew Lynch, President, Tennessee Labor Council

Mr. Hugh T. McDade, Public Relations Manager, Tennessee Operations, Aluminum Company of America

Dr. LeRoy A. Martin, Chancellor, The University of Chattanooga

The Honorable William E. Miller, Chief Judge, United States District Court, Middle District of Tennessee

Dr. Hollis A. Moore, Jr., Academic Vice President, George Peabody College for Teachers

Dr. Hollis F. Price, President, LeMoyne College

Dr. Rob Roy Purdy, Vice Chancellor, Vanderbilt University

Mr. Lester H. Robb, Executive Director, United Givers Fund, Nashville

Mr. James Tipton, Jr., Executive Director, Tennessee County Services Association

Mr. J. Howard Warf, Commissioner of Education; Chairman, State Board of Education

Dr. James S. Wilder, Jr., President, Lambuth College

INTRODUCTION

Historical Background

Fiscal year 1966 program. Dean James E. Arnold and most of the Staff in the Division of University Extension began in July 1965 to initiate the first step in anticipation of the then-proposed federal legislation for the development of community service and continuing education programs, which would later be known as Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Earlier, Governor Frank G. Clement had named The University of Tennessee as the State Agency, and President A. D. Holt had named The Division of University Extension as the sole agency responsible for the administration of Title I of the Act. By October 28, 1965, Dr. Holt had invited every institution of higher learning in Tennessee to submit proposals for Title I funding, and Dean Arnold had invited every college at The University of Tennessee to participate. The Act was passed by Congress and signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson on November 8, 1965, as Public Law 89-329.

By early March 1966, teams from the Division of University Extension visited each of the colleges and universities in Tennessee that expressed an interest in participating in Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In April 1966, after many staff meetings at Knoxville under the leadership of Vice President Herman E. Spivey and Dean Arnold, and with trips to the United States Office of Education in Washington, D. C., the Tennessee State Plan was written, largely through the efforts of Dr. Kenneth D. Wright.

By May 10, 1966, the Tennessee State Plan for Title I was printed and sent to every member of the State Advisory Council, which met in Knoxville on May 17, 1966, to approve (with only a few amendments) the Tennessee State Plan itself and the programming to be consummated through federal funding for fiscal year 1966. The next weekend, copies of the Tennessee State Plan were corrected, signed by Governor Clement (on May 19), and taken to the United States Office of Education in Washington.

On June 15, 1966, the Tennessee State Plan for Title I was officially approved by the United States Office of Education, after a two-page amendment (shown as Exhibit J) was telegraphed to Washington on June 14, 1966. On June 29, 1966, letters of obligation (contracts), signed by Vice President W. H. Read, were mailed to the participating institutions in Tennessee. For the fiscal year 1966 annual program amendment, a total amount of $193,954.00 in federal funds, matched by a total of $64,651.33 in non-federal funds, gave a total of $258,605.33 for the State Agency to put into administration and into twenty-one continuing education and community service programs to advance the cause of adult higher education in Tennessee.

Fiscal year 1967 program. Since July 1, 1966, the State Agency staff for Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has been busy in the development of continuing education and community service programs under the Tennessee State

Plan. By September 30, 1966, the fiscal year 1967 annual program amendment was developed, printed, and sent to every member of the State Advisory Council, which met again in Knoxville on October 7, 1966, to approve the amendment. It was signed by Governor Clement on October 13, 1966; it was submitted to the United States Office of Education on October 21, 1966; and it was officially approved on January 10, 1967. Contracts for eleven projects (each a continuation of an FY 1966 program) were mailed to the participating institutions on January 20, 1967. A total amount of $194,015.00 in federal funds, matched by a total of $64,671.67 in non-federal funds, gave a total of $258,686.67 to the State Agency to administer these continuing education and community service programs. On June 21, 1967, a contract was mailed for a twelfth project (funded out of excess funds remaining upon completion of one of the eleven FY 1967 programs).

Fiscal year 1968 program. On April 26, 1967, the State Agency staff requested the members of the State Advisory Council to approve a modified procedure for the receipt and development of proposals for the fiscal year 1968 annual program amendment. Every ballot received by the State Agency approved this modified procedure. By June 20, 1967, the FY 1968 annual program amendment was developed, printed, and sent to and approved by every member of the State Advisory Council. It was signed by Governor Buford C. Ellington on June 22, 1967, and it was presented to the United States Office of Education on June 30, 1967. (To date, this FY 1968 annual program amendment has not been officially approved by the USOE.)

In summary, the State Agency staff in about thirteen months has administered more than a half-million dollars in programs approved for funding during the first two federal fiscal years. In addition, the State Agency staff has submitted the required FY 1968 annual program amendment.

Role of the State Advisory Council

In an effort to utilize every available resource to implement this community service and continuing education program, the Governor of Tennessee and the President of The University of Tennessee jointly appointed a State Advisory Council of twenty members to work with the State Agency for Title I. This State Advisory Council is composed of academic leaders from the private and public colleges and universities, leaders from business and labor, leaders from the State Board and State Department of Education, and leaders from community service and civic organizations.

Although the State Advisory Council has no official policy-making or supervisory responsibilities, the Council has provided invaluable assistance to the State Agency in developing and administering the Tennessee State Plan. All aspects of the State Plan, including budgeting, allotment of funds, approval or disapproval of individual programs, and the coordination of all activities in the State, are taken before the Council for its advice and assistance. The State Agency consults with the Council on policy matters arising in the administration of the State Plan and on the development and administration of all amendments thereto. The Chairman of the State Advisory Council convenes the Council for a final consideration of all proposals. After securing the advice of the Council,

the State Agency integrates the accepted proposals into a coordinated, comprehensive, and Statewide annual program.

Purpose of the Progress and Evaluation Report

At the request of Dr. Hal R. Ramer, Chairman of the State Advisory Council, this composite progress and evaluation report of fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967 Title I proposals in Tennessee was prepared by the State Agency staff for presentation to members of the State Advisory Council on August 3, 1967.

Each Title I progress and evaluation report includes the following data: program identification, statement of the problem, program objectives, program activities, program status, institutional evaluation, and State Agency recommendation.

Each section in each individual program evaluation, except for the State Agency recommendation, was prepared from data contained in (1) the proposal form, (2) the Notice of Activation, and (3) the quarterly progress and evaluation reports (with their attachments, including brochures, publicity, program rosters, evaluation instruments, and the like).

These progress and evaluation reports cover the period from July 1, 1966, through June 30, 1967. In a few cases, additional data from such items as financial reports, when received after this latter date, were not always reflected in the reports.

Overview of the Program Evaluations

The twenty-one proposals funded for fiscal year 1966 involved the participation of seventeen colleges and universities in Tennessee, in whole or in part. The twelve proposals funded for fiscal year 1967 involved the participation of fourteen institutions, in whole or in part. Eleven of the FY 1967 proposals are continuations of the FY 1966 proposals. These eleven FY 1967 continuations are evaluated in conjunction with the 1966 programs. Included in this report, then, to members of the State Advisory Council, will be twenty-two evaluations.

Many of these twenty-two program evaluations are comprehensive and complete simply because the institutional representatives supplied adequate and carefully selected information to the State Agency via the quarterly progress and evaluation reports. Even to the casual reader of these evaluations, it should be more than obvious which Title I proposals were carefully proposed, meticulously consummated, and adequately and thoroughly evaluated, and which were not.

In working with the various participating institutions of higher education in Tennessee, the State Agency staff has discerned that, in most cases, the direct success or failure of a Title I proposal hinged upon one main variable--the competency of the project director and/or institutional representative. It is hoped

that staff members in Tennessee's colleges and universities will see the "big picture," to think big, as it were, as they develop and participate in action programs in solving some of the most urgent problems of the society and the economy in which we live.

State Agency Recommendation

For the best overview of the twenty-two programs funded under Title I for FY 1966 and FY 1967, the State Agency would recommend a cumulative and sequential reading of the twenty-two State Agency recommendations.

Most evaluation reports were most adequate in supplying the following: (1) a copy of the evaluation instrument (questionnaire) with a report of the results of the questionnaire; (2) a brochure or program completely describing the forum or seminar and its program contents and participants; (3) a complete list of attendees, with accompanying affiliation or occupation: (4) a Xerox copy of all pertinent newspaper publicity and news articles; and (5) a complete list of staff with name, rank, and title.

Less often did the evaluation reports supply the following necessary data: (1) a full description of the content of course, workshop or seminar; (2) any unique or innovative features; (3) an institutional appraisal of the progress which the project made toward attainment of its objectives; and (4) a careful analysis of the value of the proposal, its effectiveness of presentation, and its practicality.

In a few cases, no community problem was identified; therefore, no program objectives were (or could be) formulated to aid in the solution of the problem. In particular this point requires deep thought on the part of the participating institution; and it requires participant involvement in all stages of the program--in its genesis, in its planning, in its development, in its presentation and consummation, and in its final evaluation.

The State Agency staff will be alert to various problems which were glaringly evident in the compilation of this progress and evaluation report. These problems should be shared with the State Advisory Council and with the various participating institutions; the alleviation of such problems in the planning, consummation, and final evaluation of Title I programs should result in better community service and continuing education programs for Tennessee in the years ahead.

In particular, the State Agency would call attention to at least seven critical areas.

1. Care should be taken to ensure that a proposal description clearly states an identified and documented community problem to be solved.

2. Care should be taken to ensure that program objectives are designed to aid in the solution of identified community problems; they should not primarily be designed to provide equipment, facilities, and funds for scholarships.

3. Care should be taken to ensure that Title I proposals are designed to meet the unique educational needs of adults whose education has been completed or interrupted; this would preclude the proposal from being a "regular" undergraduate course offered to "regular" undergraduates.

4. Care should be taken to ensure that there is sufficient participant awareness and involvement in the planning of a proposal.

5. Care should be taken to ensure that institutional capabilities are not constituted primarily from outside sources.

6. Care should be taken to ensure that all expenditures are listed as eligible costs as outlined in the Title I Regulations.

7. Care should be taken to ensure that definite methodology be established for participant evaluation, and that a cogent and thorough institutional evaluation be made of every proposal.

In this report, the State Agency has sought to provide an honest and complete appraisal of the Title I programs in Tennessee. It should be kept in mind that Title I is a new program, and that guidelines and directives have often been developed "after the fact." Too, there have been, in this new venture, a few problems, such as continuity of funding and institutional interest and competency, in the development of community service and continuing education programs. Title I is only about one year old, and it is the view of the State Agency that much has been accomplished in this first year. Title I is in business in Tennessee; it has developed from a dream, into an idea, into law; under the law, the Act has been implemented, funded, and put into existence as an action program for the people of Tennessee.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER ONE

Program Identification

"Demonstration Research Project on the Identification of Community Needs," conducted at The University of Tennessee by Dr. Nolen E. Bradley, Director of the State Agency for Title I. FY 1966 funding: federal--$25,017.64; non-federal--$8,339.22; total--$33,356.86. Cooperating institutions: Austin Peay State College, Bethel College, Carson-Newman College, East Tennessee State University, Knoxville College, Lambuth College, LeMoyne College, Memphis State University, Middle Tennessee State University, Southwestern at Memphis, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University, Tennessee Technological University, and The University of Tennessee at Martin.

Statement of the Problem

If the college or university is to serve a significant role in meeting complex contemporary social problems, it must provide--both on the campus and in the communities--educational programs directed toward the solution of these problems. To provide effective community service and continuing education programs, the institution must first identify community problems and needs, interpret these problems and needs, concentrate its skills and resources upon the development of workable solutions, and then translate these solutions into innovative educational activities for the communities in its service area. This will also require community involvement.

Program Objectives

It is the purpose of this project to demonstrate at least two things: (1) one means of identifying the community problems in Tennessee; in doing this, several methods of collecting data are employed, with differing combinations of colleges and universities cooperating in data collection; and (2) methods of opening channels of communication or of beginning dialogues between these college and university staff members and selected members of the communities--governmental officials, influential community leaders, and lay citizens.

Program Activities

As a preliminary to the actual demonstration procedures, a survey instrument was developed which could serve both as a mail questionnaire and as a personal interview guide. At an organizational meeting of representatives from institutions cooperating in the demonstration research project held in Nashville, Tennessee, on June 22, 1966, the survey instrument was introduced and adopted as a guide for the collection of data on community needs in Tennessee. In an effort to utilize the special resources of each participating institution and to capitalize on their familiarity with their various service areas, the State was divided into eight areas; the various institutions of higher education were assigned the responsibility for the project and reporting the results in their

respective areas. The geographical unit of community structure in the project was basically the county; however, the larger metropolitan areas were usually considered separately. Of the ninety-five counties in Tennessee, seventy-seven were visited at least once during the project, and most were visited several times for the collection of data.

This project sought to make a valid identification of community needs through interviewing the people in a community who could provide information on (1) the problems which existed in their area, (2) the nature and extent of each problem, and (3) the priority for solving these problems. Selective processes, such as stratified random sample by census tracts or districts of the study area, were utilized in determining local citizens to be interviewed. In addition, interviews were held with selected officials in each county, such as elected chief officials of counties and municipalities, county judges, school superintendents, county farm agents, hospital administrators, welfare workers, home demonstration agents, county health directors, heads of local employment security offices, directors of local planning commissions, chief law enforcement officers, officials of civic organizations, bankers, and newspaper publishers. These county and municipal officials provided much of the information for the area reports, but information from lay citizens was also utilized. Those institutions participating in this demonstration research project demonstrated several methods of collecting data; differing combinations of colleges and universities cooperated in demonstrating these methods of data collection.

In Area One, which comprised all of the twenty-one counties in West Tennessee, the project was completed by representatives from a consortium of six public and private colleges and universities (Memphis State University, Bethel College, University of Tennessee at Martin, LeMoyne College, Southwestern at Memphis, and Lambuth College) and coordinated by one of them. These six institutions studied only seven counties, used a modification of the original questionnaire, and sought to emphasize the tabulation of responses, through a magnitude order index, into definite priority rankings.

Areas Two, Three, Four, and Five were located in Middle Tennessee. A single State-supported institution in Area Two (Austin Peay State College), in Area Four (Middle Tennessee State University), and in Area Five (Tennessee Technological University) collected data from ten to fourteen counties. The institution in Area Two modified the original questionnaire into an outline of problem areas. The data in Area Three were collected by a single State-supported institution (Tennessee A. and I. State University), which completed a study of only one county--Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County--including the capital city of Tennessee.

Areas Six, Seven, and Eight were located in East Tennessee. Two institutions (The University of Tennessee and Knoxville College) joined forces in Area Six, and data were gathered from a nineteen-county area which contained two metropolitan areas. The original questionnaire was used as an interview guide, and researchers from the two institutions investigated community needs cooperatively. Data were collected in Area Seven by a private liberal arts college (Carson-Newman College), and the report from this six-county area was supplemented by a detailed indepth study of one of these counties in Appalachia--Hancock County--the eighth poorest county in the United States. Data were

collected in seven counties in Area Eight by a single State-supported institution (East Tennessee State University), which relied solely on twenty-four questionnaires returned from officials, community leaders, and the general public.

These eight area reports were compiled and edited by the State Agency for Title I, and published as The Identification of Community Needs in Tennessee on May 29, 1967. This Statewide Report on a community service and continuing education program was distributed to over 1,100 government officials, community leaders, educational leaders, and lay citizens.

Program Status

All eight area reports have been completed and the Statewide Report has been published and distributed. The culminating activity of this demonstration research project will be the Conference for Institutional Representatives on August 4-5, 1967, in Nashville, Tennessee.

Institutional Evaluation

The eight area reports served as institutional evaluations; considered jointly they successfully demonstrated (1) one means of identifying the community problems in Tennessee, and (2) methods of opening channels of communication between college and university staff members and selected members of the communities.

Four of the area reports were exceptionally well prepared and documented; three of these reports were printed and distributed in the area which they covered. Two of the area reports were substandard, with marginal documentation and little evidence of adhering to the program objectives; however, the force of the other six reports was sufficient to attain the stated objectives as demonstrated in the Statewide Report. The published report received considerable newspaper publicity in Tennessee; numerous favorable comments were received by the State Agency.

State Agency Recommendation

The successful consummation of this proposal by representatives of the fourteen colleges and universities in Tennessee in eight area reports, the editing and compilation of these into one Statewide Report, and its distribution to more than 1,100 college and university staff members and selected members of Tennessee communities resulted in the most valuable of all the Title I proposals completed to date. Without the data contained in this Statewide Report, documented for the first time under one cover, the State Agency staff would not be able to continue to develop a comprehensive, coordinated and Statewide program of continuing education and community service programs. The State Agency staff would deem it feasible for each participating institution, as a regular part of its activities, annually to update the data for its service area, utilizing the channels of communication established by this program. This was a pilot or demonstration project, and probably will not need to be done again. This project could be updated in 1970 with State Agency administration funds.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER TWO

Program Identification

"Training for School Board Members Throughout Tennessee" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number One--"An Inservice Training Program for School Board Members in Tennessee"), conducted by the College of Education at The University of Tennessee by Dr. Dewey H. Stollar, Associate Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision. FY 1966 funding: federal--$45,750.00; non-federal--$15,250.00; total--$61,000.00. FY 1967 funding: federal--$47,212.00; non-federal--$15,737.34; total--$62,949.34. (Total funds for both proposals--$123,949.34.) Cooperating agencies and institutions: Tennessee State Department of Education, Tennessee Education Association, Tennessee Association of School Administrators, Tennessee School Board Association, Austin Peay State College, East Tennessee State University, George Peabody College for Teachers, Memphis State University, Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University, Tennessee Technological University, The University of Chattanooga, and The University of Tennessee at Martin.

Statement of the Problem

In many Tennessee communities the elected representatives of the people, the school board members, are not carrying out their responsibilities to their communities or to the children.

Many superintendents listed the board of education as the major obstacle to carrying out their jobs in a professional manner. Some school board members felt their jobs were political patronage posts, and many of them sought election to the board to represent special segments of the community. Many school boards spend a good deal of their time considering petty details rather than the fundamental problems of the schools. These and related information lead to the conclusion that one of the most serious problems of the public schools in many communities may be the irresponsibility or ineffective behavior of their school boards.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to help school board members understand more fully their role in educational policy making; (2) to help school board members understand more clearly the issues facing educators in Tennessee, the region, the nation, and the world today; (3) to help school board members develop better understanding of professional relationships of boards of education with superintendents, other professional staff members, non-professional staff members, students, citizens, etc.; (4) to help school board members understand more fully the scope and sequence of curriculum change to meet present and future educational needs of Tennessee's present and future generations; (5) to help school board members understand more fully the financing of education in Tennessee; (6) to help school board members understand more fully the changing role of teacher organizations and the development of negotiations; (7) to help

school board members understand more fully the legal functions and scope of the board of education's role and responsibility; (8) to help school board members understand the expanding role of the federal government in local education decisions; and (9) to help school board members understand more fully the fiscally dependent board of education's relationship to other governmental agencies.

Program Activities

For the FY 1966 program there were two series of inservice training programs; the first series was conducted during the fall of 1966, and the second series was conducted in the spring of 1967. A total of 157 school board members and school superintendents attended the fall series of training programs in one of the following ten locations: East Tennessee State University and The University of Tennessee on October 8-9, 1966; Memphis State University and The University of Tennessee at Martin on October 15-16, 1966; The University of Chattanooga and Tennessee Technological University on October 22-23, 1966; Middle Tennessee State University, Austin Peay State College, and Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University on October 29-30, 1966; and George Peabody College for Teachers on November 5, 1966.

The topics for this fall series included: (1) curricular issues in education--implications for school board members; (2) the changing role of teacher organizations and the development of negotiations; (3) professional relationships of boards of education with superintendents, other professional staff members, non-professional staff members, students, citizens, etc ; (4) issues in education--implications for school board members; (5) the legal functions and scope of the boards of education's role and responsibility; and (6) school board members' role in educational policy making.

A total of 384 school board members, superintendents, principals, and teachers attended the spring series of training programs, decentralized at one of the following fourteen locations: Paris and Manchester on April 10, 1967; Trenton and Lawrenceburg on April 11, 1967; Waverly and Covington on April 12, 1967; Henderson and Lebanon on April 13, 1967; Crossville on April 17, 1967; Madisonville on May 1, 1967; Clinton on May 2, 1967; Dandridge on May 3, 1967; Hixon on May 4, 1967; and Greeneville on May 8, 1967.

The topics for the spring series included: (1) curricular innovations, role of the school board member, evaluation of innovations, curricular fads, and newer trends; (2) school board public relations, accentuate the positive-negate the negative, two-way system of communication, evaluation of public relations program, and critical areas for school board in public relations; and (3) school building design innovations. In addition, there were small group discussions and board member panels reacting to the presentations.

For the FY 1967 program the tentative schedule of meetings and topics are: summer 1967 at Nashville, Tennessee on school board policy development; fall 1967 at fourteen locations throughout the State on legal obligations of board members; winter 1968 at fourteen locations throughout the State on

appraising educational outcomes; and spring 1968 at fourteen locations throughout the State on school board-community relations and two-way communications.

In addition to the usual media of presentation, cases and simulated situations will be used because they offer unique opportunities for developing competence in perceptive generalization.

Program Status

The program planned for the summer of 1967 will be conducted August 20-21, 1967, as the final series of the FY 1966 proposal. The FY 1967 proposal will be conducted during the next fall, winter, and spring as scheduled.

Institutional Evaluation

Participants in the fall series were administered a forty-two item true-false test and a twelve-item opinionnaire constructed from the six content areas covered during the two-day session. Seven true-false items were constructed for each content area, while the items used in the opinionnaire were taken from the total program material. A pre-test was administered to each participant prior to the beginning of formal presentations, and a post-test on the same items was administered to each participant after the two-day session.

The intent of the testing program was to determine if attitudes, understandings, and/or opinions of the participants had been altered during the intensive training session. It was recognized that two days was an extremely short period of time for a pre-test, post-test evaluation to be made; but the duration of the program necessitated this approach. Seventy-five pairs of tests were chosen for analysis. Although many other participants had pre-tests or post-tests, the seventy-five selected had complete pre-tests and had supplied most biographical data.

The chi square technique was chosen for analysis of the true-false data collected during this testing. The t-test was used for analysis of the opinion data. A test of means was used to determine whether or not a significant difference existed between pre-test and post-test measures of the opinion data. The true-false data were analyzed by total participants' score and then were categorized for additional analysis by these situational variables: (1) occupation, (2) district type, (3) age, and (4) schooling. A breakdown of each variable was employed to give an analysis by item (forty-two), by topic (seven), and by total. Due to the size of the population (N=75), some categories were not used and others had small totals.

In comparison between pre- and post-measures on all items on all participants, eight items were significant. The total test difference was also significant. For example, the response to question two "a member of a local board is a state officer" was found to differ significantly between pre- and post-tests. A logical conclusion could be that participants in the conference gained the knowledge that members of local school boards are state officers. While it is recognized that the finding of significant difference

between pre- and post-measures is not the total value of a training session, it does point up the need for continual instruction and growth on the part of school board members. The t-test analysis showed that there was a significant difference in the opinions of the participants on the issues discussed before and after the training sessions. The t-test results produced a t value of -2.17 which is significant at the .05 level of confidence for 148 degree of freedom.

The spring program content basically was set from a questionnaire mailed to board members and superintendents soliciting their thoughts on format and content for a second inservice education program. Many of the respondents had participated in the fall conference sponsored by the same groups. This information also was used as a basis for the preparation of the spring assessment instrument. The instrument was designed to measure (1) the quality of each major presentation, (2) the relative excellence of each major presentation, (3) the effectiveness of the organizational format chosen, and (4) a general reaction to the over-all program. Certain biographical data also were gathered on each participant.

Based on Statewide responses of those participants reacting to the question on the quality of the presentation on curricular innovations, role of board member, evaluation of innovations, curricular fads and newer trends, 182 (approximately 81 percent) indicated the presentations were viewed as being high in quality. The relevance of the presentation was ranked high by 162 (72 percent) of the participants.

The reaction of the presentation on school board public relations, two-way systems of communications, and the evaluation of present public relations programs was much the same; 184 participants (82 percent) ranked the quality of this presentation high as contrasted to low. The relevance of this presentation was ranked high by 162 (72 percent) of the participants. For the third major presentation area, school building design innovations, 193 participants (86 percent) ranked the quality of this presentation high; 154 participants (69 percent) thought the relevance of the presentation also was high.

When asked for reactions on the format of presentation, 135 persons noted that the panel in the general session was very worthwhile and should be used more in such situations. This is contrasted with 12 participants who said "it added little and for the most part its use should be discontinued." Reacting to the techniques of questioning the speaker from the floor, 153 persons responded that it was "very worthwhile and should be done more in such situations," and no participant considered it a waste of time. Only 10 participants ranked it "of some value, but often questions were not of general interest."

In evaluation of the small-group discussions, 85 of the participants noted that they liked the way the small groups were organized, while 28 said they had no comparative basis for making a judgement. When asked for a general feeling about the small-group sessions, 65 responded they were very worthwhile and more should have been scheduled, while 2 persons responded that they were a waste of time. It is interesting to note that in both the reactions given under the small-group discussion area, more than 100 participants failed to react in any way to either of the questions.

When asked for their general opinion considering all activities of the institute, these reactions were noted: 162 persons said the institute was very helpful, 54 said it was of some value, 3 said it was interesting, but offered little, and no participant ranked it a waste of time.

State Agency Recommendation

Considering the program content, the results of the participant evaluation, the Statewide scope of these inservice training programs, the competencies of the staff and consultants, the State Agency staff's on-the-spot personal evaluation, and the participation of the cooperating institutions and agencies, it is apparent that this particular community service program can, potentially, have a great impact on the improvement of the public school system in Tennessee. This program has made a significant step in attaining the stated objectives. Its presentation has been effective and practical because it was tailored to meet the needs of the participant group.

The Tennessee School Board Association has been revitalized; and the school board members and superintendents, whose policies and administrative procedures chart the course of the public school systems, have been provided with pertinent information about the most recent trends in education.

After two years of federal funding, with more than $123,000.00 budgeted, the objectives for this inservice training program should be fully realized. In the truest sense, the multiplier effect in this program should result in real and continuing benefits to the State of Tennessee. Title I funds in this program have provided "seed money" to finance the dissemination of the latest information in education; it is hoped that the Tennessee School Board Association can continue to provide information on future developments. Therefore, the State Agency would recommend to the State Advisory Council that no additional funds be granted to The University of Tennessee College of Education to continue the programs as outlined in these proposals.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER THREE

Program Identification

"County and City Leadership Conference," conducted at Austin Peay State College by Mr. Earl E. Sexton, Director of Development and Field Services. FY 1966 funding: federal--$1,875.00; non-federal--$625.00; total--$2,500.00.

Statement of the Problem

Generally, rural county and town leadership has not made a significant attack upon the growing problems of unemployment, health, industrial development, and land use, to name only a few. The problem is not one of indifference, but rather a lack of know-how.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to discuss mutual political problems confronting local governments in Middle and West Tennessee counties; (2) to try and find workable solutions to these complex problems by providing qualified speakers on these subjects and informally exchanging opinions and ideas with the speakers as well as with one another; and (3) to encourage the attendees to modernize the functions of local government by seeking advice from those who are qualified to render it.

Program Activities

The two-day conference was conducted at Austin Peay State College on April 20-21, 1967. Approximately fifty participants, including mayors, county judges, officials, and other community leaders from eleven Middle Tennessee counties attended the conference.

The conference was a seminar on current political problems confronting local governments. The topics included: (1) financing local government; (2) establishing and developing a community beautification program; (3) establishing and developing a community recreation program; (4) planning and land use; (5) attracting industry; and (6) intergovernmental relations.

Program Status

The program as originally approved has been completed; however, enough funds remain to conduct a followup to this conference. Plans are incomplete as to when this additional conference will be held, but it must be completed prior to June 30, 1968.

Institutional Evaluation

There appears to have been no formal participant evaluation of this program. According to the institution's evaluation, the seminar was an overall success. The remarks expressed by the participants indicated that this was time well spent. They said the informal meetings provided them the opportunity to gain greater insight into vital problems now facing local government officials; they were able to discuss the ramifications of these problems with one another as well as with the speakers. Many were hopeful that this seminar was the beginning of future similar conferences. Although the aggregate number of those attending the two-day seminar was approximately fifty, it was anticipated that more would be present. This was the only unsatisfactory feature of the seminar. A logical assumption for the somewhat limited attendance was the unforeseen action taken by the Tennessee legislature in extending its session to May 26, 1967, beyond the customary time normally devoted to the affairs of the State.

State Agency Recommendation

From the list of topics and the informal remarks of participants, it would appear that this conference was successful in attaining the stated program objectives. The State Agency feels that this was a valuable proposal, effective and practical in its presentation. A good, cogent participant evaluation should be furnished to the State Agency on the followup session of this conference.

This was a pilot program, similar to the "Seminar on Local Government" conducted by Southwestern at Memphis. The State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that a conference of this type be conducted in other areas of the State where institutions have the competency and faculty resources. Care should be taken to ensure that institutional capabilities are not constituted primarily from outside sources.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER FOUR

Program Identification

"Developing Skills of Community Leadership" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Five), conducted at Knoxville College by Mr. L. Emmett Elledge, Assistant Professor of Psychology. FY 1966 funding: federal--$5,250.00; non-federal--$1,750.00; total--$7,000.00. FY 1967 funding: federal--$5,250.00; non-federal--$1,750.00; total--$7,000.00. (Total funds for both proposals--$14,000.00.)

Statement of the Problem

Resident in the community are many Negro individuals who occupy positions and offices of leadership but who are unable or unequipped to utilize basic leadership skills effectively in carrying out their responsibilities. Resident in the community, also, are individuals who aspire to positions of leadership but who are unable to realize such personal goals because of their unpreparedness. Knoxville needs the full services of these individuals.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to assist a selected group of Negro individuals from the community in developing basic leadership skills, with emphasis upon all phases of communication and group leadership techniques; (2) to identify resources available in the community for leaders; (3) to identify some current problem areas and some ways by which developing leadership can be utilized in working toward solutions to community problems; (4) to determine appropriate followup programs and evaluations as to the positive aspects of this pilot project in developing community leadership; and (5) to develop some necessary channels of communication between various governmental officials and community leaders.

Program Activities

For the FY 1966 program this institute was conducted at Knoxville College on two nights a week for sixteen weeks from November 8, 1966, through March 21, 1967. Of the initial twenty-six participants, twenty-two were graduated with certificates of completion. These participants included machine operators, packers, welders, construction workers, truck drivers, clerks, accountants, and housewives.

The topics in this institute included: (1) human communications; (2) parliamentary procedure; (3) psychology of business relationships; (4) group dynamics; (5) community organization; (6) the basic characteristics of a leader; (7) how to be a modern leader; (8) appraising your leadership; (9) personality aspects of leadership; (10) more power to you; (11) your goals; (12) public speaking; and (13) information on definite community resources in Knoxville.

The FY 1967 program is designed to be a continuation of the FY 1966 proposal.

Program Status

The FY 1966 program as originally approved has been completed, and upon the receipt and approval of the Final Financial Report the records for this proposal can be closed. The FY 1967 program is scheduled to meet twice weekly from October 15, 1967, to March 15, 1968.

Institutional Evaluation

Sixty names were submitted for consideration by personnel directors in several industries, by community leaders, and by members of the Knoxville College faculty. All nominees were interviewed, and twenty-eight Negro participants were selected by the staff, based on some indication of potential leadership qualities. The group was rather heterogeneous in terms of age, educational level, geographical residency, and socio-economic level.

Proposed procedures for evaluating the project included pre- and post-course testing with selected, appropriate instruments, staff evaluation of all aspects of the program and analysis of leadership qualities attributable to the project.

Pre-testing of all participants for evaluative and instructor-orienting purposes was accomplished during the first two sessions of the institute. The IPAT 16 P. F. (Personality Factor) Test, Form A, 1962 Edition, and the Oral Reading subtest of the Wide Range Achievement Test were utilized.

The first followup meeting was held on March 28, 1967. At this session the participants were given some feed-back regarding the pre- and post-testing by a consulting psychologist. Some future plans for additional meetings were discussed. Further followup meetings were scheduled for April-July 1967.

Basically, the IPAT 16 P. F. Test measures normal, stable personality factors, and significant changes are not expected from pre- to post-testing of a group of individuals. The first-order analysis indicated six group changes; these changes included the inclination to be more outgoing as a group, to be more socially bold, to be less apprehensive, to be more experimental and analytical, and to have less tendency to follow urges with higher self-concept control.

All changes appeared to be in the expected or desired direction. In light of the fact that this instrument was designed to measure personality factors of the normal population, it was rather remarkable that any changes occurred. There were no "bad" or negative changes reflected in these data as shown by the profile sheets. Individual participants may have changed more than the group data indicated. The scores were all essentially within the middle (sten 5 or 6), indicating that the group selected were average or

normal individuals. Average in this case does not mean mediocre; rather, "like most other people on which the instrument has been established." Of the more than 2,000 individuals tested with this instrument, the norms have been established on an all-white (Caucasian) population. According to the consulting psychologist to the institute, this group of individuals was the first Negro group the instrument had been used with; and these reported results may have some interesting implications. For example, the profiles showed no differences from the normative group. If this instrument is used with other Negro groups and the results hold true, there may be an implication that differences between racial and ethnic groups are due to culture and environment, and not due to hereditary factors per se.

The reported test data gave some indication that the group of individuals who participated in the institute made changes in a desirable direction. The changes indicated seem logical.

The congeniality of the selected group was noted early in the project by the directors. This apparently had advantages in maintaining high interest throughout the institute. Group-goal motivation appeared to be at a high level during the project. Attendance was good-to-excellent. Discussion with the participants and a preliminary questionnaire indicated that the participants were gratified with the program. The subject areas outlined in the initial proposal were all dealt with at some time during the four month project. The graduates are becoming involved in community and civic activities, as reported in the followup meetings.

In brief, the attainment of objectives of the institute is best described as gratifying for all persons concerned. A base of operations for similar programs under Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965, appears to have been established.

State Agency Recommendation

It would appear from the institution's evaluation and from the course content that this institute was successful to a major degree in attaining the stated program objectives. The State Agency staff feels this was one of the better programs approved for funding; it appeared to be most effective and practical in its presentation. Much of the success of this program was directly attributable to the efforts of the institute director.

The State Agency staff would suggest that the format and materials utilized in this institute be assembled in an exportable package and be made available to other institutions and groups where there is a need for a similar program in developing skills of community leadership. There is a definite need for community service programs to develop the leadership potentials of disadvantaged peoples, including the indigent and minority groups.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER FIVE

Program Identification

"Race Relations Conference," conducted at LeMoyne College by Miss Martelle Trigg, Professor of Sociology. FY 1966 funding: federal--$1,875.00; non-federal--$625.00; total--$2,500.00. Cooperating agency: War on Poverty Committee.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is a need for improvement of interracial understanding and for opening a channel of communication between leaders of both races.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to relieve racial tensions and avert disastrous crises such as those now plaguing the larger cities of the nation through thinking together on common problems; and (2) to assess progress made in human relations in Memphis since the Supreme Court decision of 1954.

Program Activities

The one-day conference was held on the LeMoyne College campus on November 12, 1966. This conference had approximately 125 in attendance, including members and directors of civic organizations and action committees, faculty members at LeMoyne, Siena College, and The University of Tennessee, representatives of the press and radio, public school teachers and employees of the Memphis Board of Education, members of Tennessee General Assembly, religious leaders, police and juvenile court employees, and students from four local colleges on a space available basis.

This conference was a community check-up in human relations. The topics included: (1) community image makers; (2) human relations and the police; (3) employment; (4) housing; (5) education; and (6) opportunities for youth. There were two addresses, entitled "The Tragic Gap between Civil Rights Law and Its Enforcement," and "New Focus in Housing and Urban Development."

Program Status

The program as originally approved has been completed. Upon the receipt and approval of a Final Financial Report, the records for this proposal can be closed.

Institutional Evaluation

The immediate post-conference evaluation was conducted by the participants and the planning committee. Attendees who expressed themselves felt the conference was both worthwhile and timely and that it should be an annual affair.

They liked the atmosphere, the speakers, and the opportunity to express themselves, learn of new programs, and get ideas for action. One of the group chairmen felt he and his consultants were unprepared for the job. Other comments from attendees indicated that more time should be allowed for group meetings, and that the young people of the community should be invited in larger numbers.

The committee felt that the conference was an unqualified success. The committee noted the problem which arose in relation to the "Memos," which were written separately by two persons on the same topic; this was done to serve as a check, so that data omitted in one report might be included in the other. The fact that incorrect data were released on two of the "Memos" indicated that the sources of information used were inadequate. More careful selection of such reporters and sources of information seems indicated. The committee recognized the need for longer small-group sessions and the inclusion of more young people in the conference group. It was suggested that the planning committee might need to set guidelines for group chairmen and consultants; it could not be assumed that all know what is expected of them.

A group of eleven program evaluators, composed of the chairmen, committee members, and local consultants for the conference, met on May 13, 1967, for the purpose of evaluating the conference and considering future directions. It was the consensus of the group that a followup conference would be beneficial to the community, not only in informing the people in attendance, but also in reviewing the work being done locally in the area of human relations. The group reported suggestions relating to structure of the conference, content of the conference, and dissemination of the findings.

In relation to the second objective of the program, the findings of the discussion groups indicated that several significant changes need to be made to improve relations between the races in Memphis. First, an increased and more thorough coverage should be made of the Negro community activities in the daily newspapers and other mass media. Second, policemen should be educated in human relations in order to improve police-community relations. Additional provisions should be made to prepare Negroes to fill more skilled jobs. Also, in education, efforts should be made to secure better teachers and to include Negro representation on the school board.

The section on housing recognized the need for more public housing for lower income groups to meet the needs of large and small families and for special housing for the senior citizen. It was suggested that private enterprise should be encouraged to provide housing for the middle and upper income groups; that urban renewal could be made more effective through better long-range planning; and that a citizen's housing committee should be formed to point up needs and encourage local governmental officials in meeting these needs.

State Agency Recommendations

From an intense review of the panel reports, speeches, and evaluation reports, the State Agency staff believes that this conference was eminently successful in attaining the second stated objective and could have better attained the first stated program objective by attracting a larger participation or representation from white community leaders.

Although community development programs of this type may seem to be passé, the State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that there is a definite need for community service programs for the whole spectrum of difficulties besetting disadvantaged peoples (including the indigent and minority groups) as documented in the Statewide Report on The Identification of Community Needs in Tennessee.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER SIX

Program Identification

"Extensive Work with Low-Income Families," conducted by the College of Home Economics at The University of Tennessee by Dr. Maragret Perry, Assistant Dean. FY 1966 funding: federal--$7,500.00; non-federal--$2,500.00; total--$10,000.00. Cooperating agencies: Tennessee State Department of Education, Tennessee Home Economics Association, Tennessee State Department of Public Welfare, and West Tennessee School Lunch Directors.

Statement of the Problem

There is a need for better understanding of the whole area of poverty and special problems related to work with low-income groups. There is also a pertinent need for developing effective methods and techniques of working with them as individuals, as families, and as groups. Preliminary studies have indicated that, although professionals who work with low-income groups were willing and had ample opportunity to work with and to be of service to these groups through many current programs, a need existed for more training in ways and means of attacking and solving the problems encountered in this type of work.

Program Objectives

The project is planned: (1) to give professional workers a better awareness and understanding of the problems involved; and (2) to teach them methods of approach and solutions to the problems. It deals specifically with acquainting people with poverty, prejudice, problems of housing, food, clothing, psychology and physiological problems in working with low-income groups. Occupational training in food service is a complete second phase of the program.

Program Activities

The program consisted of two two-week courses conducted at The University of Tennessee at Martin on June 12-25, 1967, and June 26-July 7, 1967. Thirty-six participants registered for Home Management and Family Economics 5710 and twenty-four registered for Institution Management 5710. (Fourteen of the registrants participated in both courses.) Ages of participants ranged from 24 to 62 with an average age of 45 for the group. Graduate, undergraduate, and audit credit were allowed to fit the needs of the individuals. The participant group was composed of high school teachers, home economics teachers, Agricultural Extension Service home agents, college professors, school lunch program supervisors, a dietitian, and community action program personnel.

Areas of study included review of socio-economic facts and forces, prejudice, implications for family living at all income levels, shifts from an agricultural to an industrialized to a service oriented society, the role of governmental agencies and programs, definitions and motives of social work, the home

economics profession's social conscience and responsibility for family life to community, poverty eradication possibilities, employment, public and voluntary agencies, money and time management, housing improvement, food, nutrition, medical care, and occupational training. The type of instruction used was varied, but one of the main drawing points of the program was the informality of the classroom. Field trips were made to private homes in the company of a social worker, to nursing homes and to the homes of other low-income groups. After each field trip, sessions were planned for group discussions. Other phases of the program included films with discussions, oral reports, written evaluations of trips, evaluations of the participants in the field trips, and written reports on selected topics.

Program Status

This program has been completed, and the records for this proposal will be closed upon receipt and approval of the Final Financial Report.

Institutional Evaluation

Methods of evaluation included a preliminary questionnaire containing ten questions, a one-page written evaluation containing seven questions, participant oral evaluation (discussion), and the director's oral and written evaluation. All participants indicated that this course was a good use of Title I funds and that a workshop next summer would be useful to them.

Here are some excerpts from the written evaluations: "Most helpful were the methods used to get us involved--letting us see the need (visits to impoverished) and then working from there." "Information, facts, and statistics helped to make me more aware of the problems." "It has helped me to realize and face reality that we have low-income families living in a situation that needs much improvement if their lives are to be fruitful." ". . . has helped me to take a good look at myself and my attitude toward poverty. Before this class I thought I had no prejudices. I immediately realized that I did. Now after nine days in class my whole attitude is changed. I am converted. I am determined to work in my community in every way possible to help the poor." ". . . has broadened our professional outlook and has instilled in us the desire (because of the great need) to look or be aware of areas where we can be of service. We have been awakened to the importance of not becoming or of not remaining complacent." ". . . has been a rewarding experience. I realize how little I know and how much there is to learn. I certainly have a better understanding of the public assistance program which should help me in the classroom. The reports were so exciting; it was well worth the time."

The questionnaires included an item related to the number of persons with whom the participants might come in contact and influence during the next year. The group indicated that approximately 49,000 persons would be reached directly by this workshop. The number of indirect influences is incalculable.

The uniqueness of the program was its manner of presentation and the bringing together of the varied backgrounds of directors, consultants, and

participants to discuss the problems. Each individual was an asset to the program. The program was unique also in that it combined a continuing education program with a community service program. While providing course work for continuing education of the participants, the course material was for use in community service with low-income groups.

The recommendations for the future from the class are: (1) that a similar course be offered in other geographic areas in the state; (2) that a similar course be repeated at the Martin campus for those unable to attend in 1967; (3) that information pertaining to the course be made available to allied fields; and (4) that a sequential course of similar nature be offered on the Martin campus.

State Agency Recommendation

From a review of the content of these courses and the comments of participants, it would appear that these courses were successful to a major degree in attaining the stated program objectives. The State Agency feels this was a valuable proposal, effective and practical in its presentation; in fact, this was one of the best FY 1966 programs as it sought to aid in the solution of a very real community problem in upper West Tennessee. This was one of the few programs the State Agency staff was able to visit, observe, and evaluate first hand.

This could well be considered a pilot program, and the State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that serious consideration and action should be given to the recommendations listed above in the institutional evaluation.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER SEVEN

Program Identification

"Business and Economic Forum Series" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Six--"Business and Economic Forum"), conducted at Austin Peay State College by Mr. Glenn S. Gentry, Chairman, Department of Business. FY 1966 funding: federal--$1,200.00; non-federal--$400.00; total--$1,600.00. FY 1967 funding: federal--$2,400.00; non-federal--$800.00; total--$3,200.00. (Total funds for both proposals--$4,800.00.)

Statement of the Problem

The problem is that there is no systematic method of communication in the Austin Peay State College service area to bring economic thought and trends, both theoretical and practical, to business leaders, the general public, and students.

Program Objective

The objective is to update and stimulate the economic thinking of business and non-business leaders in this upper Middle Tennessee area.

Program Activities

For the FY 1966 proposal, the first of two scheduled forums was conducted at Austin Peay State College on November 3, 1966. Approximately 450 were in attendance at this forum, including 150 businessmen of the community, 9 out-of-Clarksville bankers (3 from Kentucky), several professors from other Tennessee colleges and universities, and 287 interested students on a space available basis. This first forum was on the money market. The topics included: (1) short-term business and consumer money; (2) securities market; (3) state and local government money; and (4) the current money market and the Federal Reserve System. The second forum in this series is planned for early fall 1967 on transportation and a Cumberland River port for the Clarksville area.

For the FY 1967 proposal four forums are planned in the areas of consumer affairs, the problems in distribution of goods, accounting problems with emphasis on taxation, and economic concepts.

Program Status

The FY 1966 program has one more forum to be conducted. The FY 1967 program is still in the final planning stages.

Institutional Evaluation

A total of sixty-nine attendees were requested at random to complete a short questionnaire containing three questions, including one calling for comments and suggestions. All sixty-nine felt that the forum was a worthwhile project and should be continued. The comments and suggestions made on this forum were favorable.

According to the institution's evaluation, those who worked directly in the preparation of the November 3 program felt that it was most successful. The topic for discussion was a most timely one and all the speakers were most effective in the handling of their subject as well as in adhering closely to the general theme of the forum.

Several participants wrote letters expressing their appreciation for the program. Two typical comments follow: "I understand that you intend to continue forums of this type from time to time, and I would certainly encourage you to do so--there is a great need today for a better understanding of the factors that effect our economic life." "Just a word to tell you how much I enjoyed your Economic Forum. The speakers were excellent and their subjects were well chosen. It was one of the most worthwhile such events I have ever attended."

The remainder of the FY 1966 proposal and the FY 1967 proposal will be evaluated upon completion of the programs.

State Agency Recommendation

At this time it is difficult to evaluate the true impact of these two proposals, since only one of six scheduled forums has been completed to date. It appears from the participant and institutional evaluation that this one forum was well received and was successful in meeting the stated program objectives.

The State Agency staff feels that community service programs of the calibre exhibited in the first forum definitely aid in the solution of those community problems outlined in the Title I legislation. However, the State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that these two forum series be completed and fully evaluated before approving a continuation of this program with federal funding at Austin Peay State College.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER EIGHT

Program Identification

"Leadership Education in Economic Development," conducted at Bethel College by Dr. James Potts, Professor of Economics. FY 1966 funding: federal--$6,750.00; non-federal--$2,250.00; total--$9,000.00.

Statement of the Problem

Bethel College is situated in the "hub" of three West Tennessee counties which are making economic progress but could profit further by training of their leadership. Present industry could be served, and more industry could be attracted as a result of leadership development. The number one problem in this area hinges upon the attitudes of those persons who perform the leadership function in various communities. There are three aspects: leaders are largely unaware of real problems; leaders are even less aware of procedures that might alleviate recognized problems; and leaders are totally unwilling to undertake cooperative programs with neighboring communities to resolve common problems.

Program Objectives

This program will provide governmental and community leaders with precise information on the economic and industrial needs and resources of the area so that plans might evolve for development of the area. Specific objectives are: (1) to increase awareness of the problems; (2) to encourage activity toward solution of the problems; and (3) to promote additional cooperative studies of particular community problems.

Program Activities

This program remains in the planning stage. It is tentatively scheduled for the 1967 fall quarter at Bethel College.

Program Status

Since this program was not completed in the time period as originally approved, it has been extended with completion mandatory prior to June 30, 1968.

Institutional Evaluation

This program will be evaluated both by the participants and Bethel College.

State Agency Recommendation

Ostensibly, this proposal, as originally envisaged by Bethel College, and as outlined in the program objectives, could contribute materially to the leadership development of governmental and community leaders in upper West Tennessee.

In order for a continuing education and community service program to attain its greatest potentiality in the solution of an identified community problem, there must be early, continuous, and significant participant involvement in the planning of the program. This proposal exemplifies the difficulties encountered where there apparently has been no significant involvement of the participant group in the planning stages. Consultation with the participant group during all phases of the program would appear to be an essential ingredient of every successful Title I program. Before a proposal is submitted to the State Agency, care should be exercised by the participating institution to assure that there is sufficient participant awareness and involvement in planning to determine that a program can be consummated.

Since these are FY 1966 federal funds advanced to Bethel College in September 1966, the State Agency staff believes that this institution has the obligation to complete the project to the best of its ability, although amendments may be made in consultation with the State Agency staff.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER NINE

Program Identification

"Establishment of Institute of Urban Development" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Seven--"Expansion of Institute of Urban Development"), conducted at Memphis State University by Mr. Paul R. Lowry, Director, Bureau of Business and Economic Research. FY 1966 funding: federal--$5,437.50; non-federal--$1,812.50; total--$7,250.00. FY 1967 funding: federal--$18,519.00; non-federal--$6,173.00; total--$24,692.00. (Total funds for both proposals--$31,942.00). Some cooperating agencies: Memphis-Shelby County Planning Commission; Harland Bartholomew and Associates; Shelby County Quarterly Court; and Shelby County Property Assessor's Office.

Statement of the Problem

A need exists in the urban area of Shelby County and other West Tennessee counties for additional adult education in community problems and training of professional and sub-professional personnel in the method of identifying and dealing with community problems.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to designate and develop programs that will lead to more personnel trained in urban and community problems, including refresher courses for personnel in public administration and urban planning, and seminars on community problems; and (2) to make a continuing study of the community needs in education and training programs that will assist the West Tennessee communities in their social and economic growth.

Program Activities

For the FY 1966 program the Institute of Urban Development was established on July 1, 1966, as a department of the Division of Research and Services at Memphis State University. During the first year this program was in operation, the following activities were conducted:

1. The Institute organized and directed a conference on West Tennessee urban and community problems on July 15, 1966. The purpose of the program was to introduce the Title I program to government and business leaders of West Tennessee and build a group of influence centers from the various communities from which to develop attendance at future programs. A total of thirty-two were in attendance at this conference, including civic, educational, and government leaders of West Tennessee. This conference was held in conjunction with FY 1966 Proposal Number One. The program was a discussion of proposed programs for urban and community studies in West Tennessee and a discussion of various community problems, including those listed in the Title I legislation.

2. The Institute organized and directed the Fourth Annual Mid-South Business Outlook Conference on November 4, 1966, in conjunction with the School of Business Administration and Bureau of Business and Economic Research. Approximately seventy-seven people from professional fields in Tennessee attended the conference. The conference topics were: (1) the business outlook, fall 1966; (2) housing and construction outlook for 1967; (3) consumer expenditures in 1967; and (4) the business outlook for the Mid-south region.

3. The Institute organized and directed a program on property tax education directed to enlighten the public of the property assessment program and the expenditures of tax dollars in Shelby County. The program was to have been given at three different locations in Shelby County on February 6-8, 1967. On February 6, 1967, the first scheduled program was held, with only sixty persons attending. As a result of the poor interest shown by the public and the poor attendance at this meeting, the program was cancelled.

4. A series of five lecture-discussion meetings entitled "A University Series for Lake County" were begun on May 16, 1967, and continued through June 13, 1967. The non-credit courses were held in Wynnburg, Tennessee. Lectures dealt with such pertinent topics as: (1) the dignity and value of the human individual; (2) man's relationship to society and its values; (3) the value of literature in helping man to deal with his specific problems; (4) the effect of atomic power on the society; and (5) the importance of education keeping pace with changes in our world of technology. Attendees at the sessions were assigned specific readings pertaining to each topic before the discussions were held. Total attendance for the five sessions was 126, unidentified by Memphis State University as to name and affiliation.

5. The Institute has assumed the responsibility of the Real Estate Research Program. This program periodically reported housing starts and completions, zoning changes, subdivision registrations, mortgage foreclosures, real estate sales, and other pertinent data on housing and construction in the Memphis housing market area. In addition, this program made special studies on housing for minority and public agencies. Two reports, one in November 1966 and one in March 1967, have been published to date.

Program Status

The FY 1966 proposal has been completed, and the records for this program will be closed upon receipt and approval of the Final Financial Report. The FY 1967 program is scheduled to be conducted from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1968, as a continuation and expansion of the FY 1966 program.

Institutional Evaluation

Memphis State University has not furnished the State Agency with any formal participant or institutional evaluation of these five activities. Mention was made in program number four above that each attendee was asked to complete a one-page evaluation form at the end of the series, giving his appraisal, criticisms, and suggestions for improvement of a program such as the one held. According to the institution's last progress report, the attendance

at the conference on urban and community affairs (32) and the Fourth Annual Mid-South Business Outlook Conference (77) demonstrated the keen interest of business and government leaders in the programs.

State Agency Recommendation

From an appraisal of the progress reports, with their dearth of participant and institutional evaluation, it is difficult for the State Agency staff to ascertain how the specific aspects and functions of this Institute were related to identifiable community service programs designed to aid in the solution of specific, identified community problems. It is also difficult to ascertain which activities of the Institute are new and innovative and which are expansions of functions already assigned to the Bureau of Business and Economic Research. It would appear that, under the Institute of Urban Development, Memphis State University has merely consolidated under one department all the various and miscellaneous activities and services already in existence at Memphis State University in the broad area of business and economics.

The State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that the federal funds for these two proposals be considered as "seed money" to get the Institute for Urban Development soundly established and functioning in order for it to develop programs that will lead to more personnel trained to solve urban and community problems. It is further recommended that, while federal funds should not be granted carte blanche to the Institute per se, only those new individual projects which are directed toward the solution of specific community problems which can be identified by the now-established Institute should be considered for future federal funding.

To date, there has been no participant or institutional evaluation of these programs. It is recommended that State Agency action on future proposals submitted by this now-established Institute be conditioned upon the receipt of a good, valid institutional evaluation of the effectiveness of these proposals in assisting in the solution of identified community problems and in meeting the stated program objectives.

In the conduct of the FY 1967 proposal, Memphis State University should ensure that the program activities aid in the solution of identified problems and conform with the intent of Title I. From an evaluation of this project from the U. S. Office of Education, the development of a curriculum leading to an interdisciplinary degree in urban affairs at the Master's level would not be eligible for federal funds under Title I. The design and implementation of regular credit courses, and the development of new degree programs for the university students are normal functions of colleges and universities, things that the institutions already ought to be doing, and such activities are not eligible for federal funds under Title I.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER TEN

Program Identification

"Economic Development Program for Tri-State Area" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Eight--"Regional Economic Development Program"), conducted at East Tennessee State University by Dr. Fred McCune, Dean of Continuing Education.
FY 1966 funding: federal--$1,072.89; non-federal--$357.63; total--$1,430.52.
FY 1967 funding: federal--$2,637.00; non-federal--$879.00; total--$3,516.00.
(Total funds for both proposals--$4,946.52.)

Statement of the Problem

The Tri-cities and Tri-state area is located in the heart of the Appalachian region, which has been working to achieve a higher level of economic development and the reduction of poverty. If a program of economic development is to be effective, it is felt that every community will need local leaders who understand the nature of economic problems and can make an intelligent and realistic approach toward their solution.

Program Objectives

For the FY 1966 program, the objectives are: (1) to apply principles and theories of economic development to the local area, including East Tennessee, Western North Carolina, and Southwestern Virginia; and (2) to formulate and conduct research pertaining to economic conditions such as unemployment, housing, transportation, recreation facilities, and so forth.

The FY 1967 program is designed for community leaders who have an interest and some responsibility for dealing with programs for economic development. Efforts will be made to examine these problems in a realistic manner, and to make an honest evaluation of the present and proposed policies. The study of these problems within an academic environment should improve the ability of local leaders in developing sound programs for economic development.

Program Activities

The FY 1966 proposal was offered as a regular continuing education graduate course (Economics 5708) at East Tennessee State University on twelve Tuesday evenings from September 27, 1966, to December 13, 1966. This course attracted ten participants (five for graduate credit), including a teacher, an office manager, a plant manager, a television newsman, a sales representative, a plant engineer, and a retired military officer. This course, entitled "Seminar in Regional Economic Development," included the following topics: (1) introduction and theories of economic development; (2) U. S. economic growth and economic progress of the South; (3) the Appalachian region; (4) introduction to economic conditions of the Tri-state and Tri-cities area and agriculture in the Tri-state

area; (5) industrial development; (6) labor conditions (labor market, unionization, and manpower development); (7) transportation and recreation facilities; (8) marketing and distribution; (9) education; and (10) government.

The FY 1967 proposal will be offered as a regular continuing education course at East Tennessee State University on one night a week for twelve weeks from September 26, 1967, to December 12, 1967, to an estimated twenty participants, including community leaders, officials of chambers of commerce, leaders of agencies to promote economic development, and some graduate students on a space available basis.

Program Status

The FY 1966 program has been completed and the records have been closed. Only $1,430.52 out of the original budgeted total of $3,386.67 was actually expended for this program. The excess funds were transferred to another East Tennessee State University program. The FY 1967 program will be conducted during the 1967 fall quarter at East Tennessee State University.

Institutional Evaluation

For the FY 1966 proposal a four-page questionnaire containing thirty questions called for comments from the participants to evaluate content, instructors, guest speakers, assignments, and the seminar in general. All participants seemed to be well satisfied, and thought the seminar was of real value. It was the unanimous opinion of the group that the seminar should be repeated, perhaps on an annual schedule. Due to the nature of the group and the distance from which they came, it was not practical to conduct a group research project as had been proposed. However, each student was assigned a specific aspect of economic development on which he presented both an oral and a written report. Numerous areas in which additional research is needed were identified in the course of the discussions. The major weakness mentioned in the evaluation reports was the failure of more community leaders to participate. There seemed to be general satisfaction with the methods and organization of the seminar, with some preference for more guest speakers, particularly from planning agencies.

According to the institution's appraisal, fewer persons than expected attended the seminar; but the group represented diversified backgrounds, interests, and geographic locations. All participants seemed to have considerable interest and an eagerness to contribute on the basis of their background and experience.

One participant wrote a letter expressing his appreciation for the program and made the following comments. "The basic knowledge received has given me a broader understanding of the elements involved and the areas lagging in our Tri-cities development efforts. We salute East Tennessee State University for its role in our behalf. The small number taking advantage of the course in no way reflects upon the quality of subject matter covered. Should the course be offered again, I am positive you would need a larger classroom. Had

the course been fully explained to city and county governmental bodies and industrial development boards, they would have desired to take advantage of this opportunity."

For the FY 1967 proposal the participants of the seminar will be asked to complete an evaluation form at the conclusion of the program. This will be supplemented by pre- and post-seminar suggestions by faculty members of the Department of Economics at East Tennessee State University.

State Agency Recommendation

It is evident from the course schedule, assignments, bibliography, final examination, and participant evaluation that the FY 1966 seminar was well planned; and it successfully attained the first stated program objective. As mentioned in the institution's appraisal, it was not practical to conduct a group research project as had been proposed. The State Agency feels that this was a valuable proposal, and no question is raised regarding the academic aspects of this program.

Although this program was successful from an academic standpoint, a cost per participant ranging from $143.00 for the FY 1966 program to an estimated $175.00 for the FY 1967 program makes this one of the most costly programs per participant under Title I in Tennessee. The State Agency staff would recommend: (1) the early and significant involvement of the participant group in program planning; and (2) that Title I programs of this type be described in such a way as to ensure that they are not viewed by prospective participants in the restrictive format of a regular graduate course offering. This proposal had the least number of participants of any Title I program.

Since Title I programs must be directed to meet the unique educational needs of adults whose formal education has been completed or interrupted, care should be taken to ensure that programs are designed to meet these unique needs and to attract a sufficiently large number of adult leaders.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER ELEVEN

Program Identification

"Engineering Counseling and Advisory Service," conducted at Tennessee Technological University by Mr. John C. Bullington, Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering. FY 1966 funding: federal--$5,175.00; non-federal--$1,725.00; total--$6,900.00.

Statement of the Problem

Many of the industries and local government agencies in the Upper Cumberland area have engineering problems which hamper efficient operation. These problems are caused by a lack of engineering personnel to point out their deficiencies and to advise them on engineering improvements, expansions, and planning to aid in the solution of these deficiencies.

Program Objective

The objective is to establish the engineering counseling and advisory service to assist private industries and governmental agencies in the eleven-county Upper Cumberland area in finding solutions to problems relating to engineering which hamper efficient operation. Assistance will be provided in the following areas: (1) expanding or improving physical facilities, including buildings, equipment, streets, parking, water supply, waste disposal, power, and the like; (2) increasing efficiency of operation by studying methods of operation to determine a more economical utilization of manpower, materials, facilities, equipment, and power; (3) organizing courses to give employees additional education and training to enable them to work more efficiently or to qualify them to supervise other employees; (4) supplying engineering guidance and assistance to small communities or individuals desiring to start small businesses to furnish employment for people residing in their immediate area; and (5) supplying engineering guidance and assistance to small communities desiring to start a community improvement project, but lacking funds to hire a consulting engineer or architect.

Program Activities

This counseling and advisory service was in operation at Tennessee Technological University from September 1, 1966, until May 1, 1967. Mr. John A. Bullington was available on a half-time basis to perform this service.

During the eight months this program was in operation, the following assistance was provided:

1. Through work with the people in the Crawford Community, with a grant from the Livingston, Byrdstown, Jamestown, Cookeville, and Crossville

Development Corporation, and with assistance from Upper Cumberland Economic and Resources Development Center, counseling assistance was given in securing plans and specifications for the construction of a community swimming pool in connection with a child daycare center.

2. Plans for a Mountain Community shower and laundry building in Davidson have been completed. As there are no bathrooms and no water system, this facility is intended to offer the people a place to bathe and wash clothes. This project is awaiting construction funds from the F. H. A.

3. Assistance and advice have been given to the mayor and city manager of Cookeville relative to the Model Cities Program and a new Urban Renewal Program.

4. Assistance was provided Cummins Diesel Company at Cookeville in connection with the control of concrete during the construction of new facilities at the Fleetgard plant.

5. The city of Byrdstown requested help in planning a sewer system, and Putnam County School System requested assistance in planning new school buildings and the preparation of specifications for equipment purchases. (It is unclear what action was taken on these requests.)

Program Status

This program has been completed, and upon receipt of the Final Financial Report the records for this advisory service can be closed.

Institutional Evaluation

There was no formal participant evaluation. It is the opinion of the people involved in administering this program (and also of the governmental and industrial people) that a program of this nature could be very valuable to the people of this area if set up on a continuing basis. It could serve the same purpose in the realm of engineering assistance that the agricultural program does for the farming community.

One change that would need to be made in the set-up of such a program would be to make funds available to do a complete job of planning projects, of preparing plans and specifications, and of supervising construction. Many small communities and organizations simply do not have funds available to pay private consultants for this type of service.

In connection with such a program, opportunities could be sought for expanded industrial operations in this area. This eleven-county area, being a part of the Appalachia region, needs many more industries to furnish employment for the residents.

It can be said that this is a very practical, worthwhile, and needed program if it could be set up on a year-round basis. It is very hard to get

a program like this started and show any appreciable results in eight months, according to the institution's evaluation.

State Agency Recommendation

It is most difficult to evaluate the genuine effectiveness of a counseling service of this type. This innovative program, provided to a rural area lacking in basic sanitary facilities, definitely met a community need. It is trusted that there will be a significant "multiplier effect" to the services provided a few private and governmental units; however, the eight-month period of operation prevents an assessment of the program's benefits to the general populace.

The State Agency staff would recommend that careful consideration be given to any future proposals of this type in order to ensure that the scope and definite program activities are purposefully aimed at the solution of specific community problems. The scope of this proposal seems to be too general and too broad to meet specific Title I goals. The State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that such consideration of future proposals be conditioned upon the receipt of a better evaluation of the effectiveness of a service of this type; such an evaluation should give an appraisal of the progress which the project made toward the attainment of its stated objectives.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER TWELVE

Program Identification

"Swimming Pool Sanitation Supervision," conducted at East Tennessee State University by Dr. Fred McCune, Dean of Continuing Education. FY 1966 funding: federal--$1,339.88; non-federal--$446.62; total--$1,786.50. Cooperating institution: Carson-Newman College.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is the need to reduce the incidence of accidents and to minimize the spread of communicable disease in publicly and privately operated swimming pools.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to point up the problems and potential problems in the construction, operation, and maintenance of swimming pools; and (2) to prepare more adequately park and recreation directors, swimming pool owners, operators and managers, life guards, and others who have a responsibility for the management, supervision, and maintenance of swimming pools in precautions, techniques, methods, materials and equipment to be used to reduce accidents and minimize the spread of communicable disease.

Program Activities

The two-evening workshop was conducted at East Tennessee State University on June 5-6, 1967, and at Carson-Newman College on June 8-9, 1967. There were a total of forty-three participants at the two workshops, including public health officials (sanitarians), pool managers, life guards, motel and county club owners and managers, U. S. Government agencies representatives, and private agencies recreational representatives.

This nine-hour workshop included the following topics: (1) health aspects of swimming pools; (2) pool design; (3) recirculation; (4) disinfection and chemical feed equipment; (5) control of algae and fungi; (6) pool maintenance; (7) water safety; and (8) accident prevention.

Program Status

The program as originally approved has been completed; however, enough funds remain to conduct a second workshop. Plans are incomplete as to when this additional workshop will be held, but it must be completed prior to June 30, 1968.

Institutional Evaluation

A one-page program evaluation form containing nine questions was given to the participants. Thirty-five were completed and returned. Generally speaking, registrants ranked both the program and speakers high. Several minor constructive suggestions were made for improving the program. There was some overlapping of subject matter in the first program that was corrected in the second. The entire program was basic and practical. Only one registrant commented that the speakers assumed he knew more about the subject at the start than he did.

According to the institution's appraisal, it was believed the basic objectives were achieved. Basically the program was soundly conceived and well executed. One might feel the total registration of forty-three to be low in relationship to the time, effort, and cost involved; but when one considers that the safety and health of thousands of swimmers may be influenced, the program is seen in a more favorable perspective.

State Agency Recommendation

From the list of topics in the workshops it would appear that they were successful to a major degree in attaining the stated program objectives. While a larger group of participants had been anticipated, this was a worthwhile endeavor since the attendees can influence and affect the health and safety of literally thousands of other individuals in a "multiplier effect."

Since this was essentially a pilot program, the State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that similar programs be offered in other communities where there is an identified need. These programs could be conducted by East Tennessee State University or by other institutions which have the competency and faculty resources.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER THIRTEEN

Program Identification

"Workshop for Habilitative Specialists," conducted at East Tennessee State University by Dr. Fred McCune, Dean of Continuing Education. FY 1966 funding: federal--$3,366.99; non-federal--$1,122.33; total--$4,489.32.

Statement of the Problem

The promotion of meaningful communications between those disciplines concerned with the habilitation of the multi-handicapped child has been a most urgent need of our contemporary times. The accelerated pace at which knowledge is now accumulated and the overlapping information gained through the rapid discoveries being made today create a need for the effective dissemination and exchange of knowledge.

Program Objectives

The objectives are to provide to those persons engaged in the various areas concerned with multi-handicapped children an opportunity: (1) to impart knowledge relative to their discipline and to receive knowledge from other disciplines; (2) to interact in a free and informal atmosphere, thereby minimizing semantic and emotional barriers to the free interchange of information; and (3) to appreciate the need for a team approach in the total habilitation/rehabilitation of the multi-handicapped child and of man.

Program Activities

This workshop was conducted at East Tennessee State University on May 13, 1967. There were seventy-one participants in the program, including home counselors, speech and hearing therapists, special education and homebound teachers, speech and language clinicians, teachers, an optometrist, and directors of specialized institutions.

This workshop was a conference on the diagnosis and treatment of the multi-handicapped child from the multi-disciplined point of view. The topics included the diagnostic and treatment aspects of multi-handicapped children from the interdisciplinary viewpoints of educational psychology, social work, audiology and speech pathology, and neuropsychology.

Program Status

This program as originally approved has been completed. Excess funds from two other proposals at East Tennessee State University have been transferred to this proposal to enable Phase II of the program to be conducted, tentatively scheduled for the 1967 fall quarter.

Institutional Evaluation

The State Agency has received no formal participant evaluation of this program. According to the institution's evaluation, informal contacts were made with attendees following the workshop. It was felt that realistic progress was made toward attainment of the program objectives. From the nature of the occupations of the attendees and from their favorable reaction to this program, the nature of which was practical rather than theoretical, the institution felt that the proposal warranted action and that it was effectively presented.

State Agency Recommendation

From a review of the contents of this workshop and the competencies of the staff and consultants, it would appear that this program was successful in attaining the stated program objectives. Since this was essentially a pilot program, the State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that programs of this type be conducted in other areas of the State where there is an identified need and where institutions have the competency and faculty resources. This recommendation is made subject to the completion of Phase II in the fall and to the receipt of a complete participant and institution evaluation of this proposal.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER FOURTEEN

Program Identification

"Family Services Bureau Development" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Eleven), conducted at Lambuth College by Mr. Frank W. Welch, Assistant Professor of Sociology. FY 1966 funding: federal--$5,499.75; non-federal--$1,833.25; total--$7,333.00. FY 1967 funding: federal--$19,866.00; non-federal--$6,622.00; total--$26,488.00. (Total funds for both proposals--$33,821.00.) Cooperating agency: Tennessee Department of Social Welfare.

Statement of the Problem

Jackson-Madison County, as a growing urban area, has been unable to meet many increasing demands for services for families. The community has numerous problems (increasing divorce rate, increasing delinquency rate, and ever-present poverty) that could be partially solved by a coordinated agency with a family orientation. Families have little recourse unless they become troubled enough to reach welfare rolls, divorce courts, or criminal courts.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to develop a general awareness of family needs and some means of helping families meet these needs; (2) to develop an awareness of the family's significance and importance in our culture; (3) to provide opportunities for community persons in leadership capacities to strengthen these resources through education; and (4) to establish temporarily a Family Service Association which will grow into a permanent agency to serve the needs of our citizens.

Program Activities

For the FY 1966 program the Family Services Bureau was developed from August 1, 1966, through January 24, 1967, at Lambuth College. During these six months, a family service conference was held on November 17, 1966, with 122 participants, including leaders in business and industry, ministers, public school teachers, higher education personnel, physicians, nursery school workers, credit personnel, social workers, and lay persons in many jobs. About 25 percent of the attendees were Negro. The purpose of this conference was to develop a descriptive catalog of family needs in the Jackson-Madison County area, to gather advice from the participants to ascertain how some of the problems of families may be resolved, and to develop an awareness of family service needs in a growing urban area.

After a meeting on December 7, 1966, where a committee of seventeen volunteers developed an organizational plan for the formation of a permanent family life organization, the Family Services Bureau was developed. During November, December, and January the project director spent thirty hours counseling with couples from the community.

For the FY 1967 program the Family Services Bureau conducted the following activities:

1. A family life seminar on child development was conducted for three hours a week for ten weeks beginning March 13, 1967. This seminar had nineteen participants enrolled, including kindergarten, nursery school, and daycare teachers, and housewives. This seminar was designed to help parents, nursery school and kindergarten workers, and any worker with young children, understand the individual growth and developmental pattern of children and their individual needs.

2. A family life seminar on clothing the family was conducted for three hours a week for ten weeks beginning March 13, 1967. This seminar had sixteen participants enrolled, including housewives, teachers and substitute teachers, and office workers. This seminar considered the clothing needs of the family, with major emphasis placed on clothing construction.

3. A family life seminar on training persons to work with families through the schools was conducted for three hours a week for ten weeks beginning March 13, 1967. This seminar had twenty-four non-white participants enrolled, including domestic workers, teacher aides and kindergarten workers, social attendance workers, food workers, and housewives. This seminar utilized resources such as psychology, sociology, home economics, and social welfare in providing needed knowledge for persons who work with families through the schools.

4. A second family service conference was held on March 16, 1967, with forty-eight participants in attendance, including home economists, social attendance workers, ministers, guidance counselors, teachers and professors, and directors of mental health, public health, christian education, and Youth Town of Tennessee. The program concerned marriage and family counseling.

5. Two twelve-hour workshops on family counseling were held on March 16-18, 1967, with thirteen in attendance, including housewives, ministers, public welfare workers, and Y.M.C.A. workers. These workshops were concerned with assisting those who consult with and counsel families.

6. A workshop on working with teenagers was held on June 14, 1967, with ninety-six participants in attendance, including teachers, ministers, housewives, social and welfare workers, guidance counselors, college staff members, and government workers. The topic was pressures upon and challenges toward teenagers today; and five panel groups examined peer pressures, parental pressures, pressures to marry, sexual pressures, and vocational and educational pressures.

7. A third family service conference was held on June 15, 1967, with eighty-nine participants present, including teachers, ministers, social and welfare workers, business and professional leaders, government leaders, and college professors. The topic was learning to like the teenager you love. Three table groups discussed how we can express our liking for teenagers, things about teenagers which make it difficult to like them, and pressures upon teenagers which make them act as they do.

8. After preliminary and planning sessions since November 1966, a Family Service Association was formed on June 15, 1967, with the broad purpose

of determining family needs in the community through research and study, communicating these needs to the community, and creating action groups to bring about solutions to these needs. The Association was composed initially of thirty-seven interested community leaders and lay citizens.

Program Status

The FY 1966 program as originally approved has been completed and the records for this proposal have been closed. The FY 1967 program is in progress and is scheduled for completion by January 31, 1968.

Institutional Evaluation

The first family service conference held November 17, 1966, was evaluated by half of the 122 participants in an eight-item questionnaire which was mailed to them after the conference. Forty-five out of 47 responding felt the conference was well planned; 46 out of 51 respondents felt the participants at the conference were representative of the citizenry of Jackson-Madison County; 46 out of 47 respondents felt the discussion leaders were knowledgeable, perceptive of group thinking, interesting, and enthusiastic; 34 out of 39 respondents rated the speaker as excellent, and another 13 rated the speaker knowledgeable about the subject. The participants also made recommendations concerning future conferences.

According to the institution's evaluation, in general the community has been highly receptive to the program. As one is able to observe from the proceedings of the first family service conference, a need was observed by the participants for an adequate community program for families. Once the program was introduced to the community through the press and the conference, the public has been very much aware of what is being attempted.

The second family service conference held on March 16, 1967, was evaluated by about half of the 48 participants in an eight-item questionnaire. Eighteen out of 23 respondents felt this conference was well planned; 17 out of 21 respondents felt the participants at the conference were representative of the general citizenry (although more from the professional and middle class attended than did those from lower socio-economic levels); 16 out of 23 respondents rated the speaker excellent, and 4 rated the speaker average. The participants again made several recommendations about future conferences and suggested several areas of interest for future conferences.

A 25 percent respondent sample was obtained from the participants in the three family life seminars. A nine-item questionnaire was mailed to participants after the close of the conference. The teacher ratings were uniformly superior; 100 percent felt the conference leaders were always well prepared; 100 percent indicated they would participate again, that the activity was highly significant, and that this program helped to solve problems and fulfill needs. One typical participant comment: "I do not know of any experience in many years that offered so much for such a minimum expense."

According to the institution's evaluation, the program is moving satisfactorily. The enrollment in the non-credit adult education program should be evidence of the involvement of the people in the community. The increased interest in the family may be noted by general conversation with citizens. The assumption was made that when people are involved in a program they obtained something from the experience. From all indications the program is effective and is meeting genuine needs. An indepth study of participants will be conducted during the summer before involvement in the fall program.

The program is not confined to Jackson-Madison County, but throughout West Tennessee, including citizens from Trenton, Martin, Kenton, Henry City, Pickwick Dam, and Huntingdon. As of June 15, 1967, more than 500 participants were involved in about 4,100 hours of activities.

State Agency Recommendation

From an appraisal of the participant and institutional evaluation and the outline of the activities, it would appear that the Family Services Bureau has made a significant step in attaining the stated objectives. Now that the Family Services Bureau has been formally organized and has begun a program of workshops, conferences, and seminars, the State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that federal funds should not be granted in the future to the Bureau per se for a general program. It is further recommended that only new individual projects which are directed toward the solution of a specific community problem identified by the new established Bureau and Family Service Association be considered for future federal funding.

It is evident that the Family Services Bureau as envisaged by Lambuth College can be the major force as it provides services in this West Tennessee community, particularly in the area of community human resource development (covering the areas of youth opportunities, poverty, and education).

This program probably has more active institutional support than any of the other Title I programs, and the institutional representative devotes more time to the program than is done at any other institution. It is recognized that much of the success of this program was directly attributable to the efforts of the Bureau director.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER FIFTEEN

Program Identification

"Institute on Pharmacological Therapeutic Alternatives" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Nine), conducted at Meharry Medical College by Dr. Charles D. Proctor, Professor of Neuropharmacology. FY 1966 funding: federal--$4,657.50; non-federal--$1,552.50; total--$6,210.00. FY 1967 funding: $11,544.00; non-federal--$3,848.00; total--$15,392.00. (Total funds for both proposals--$21,602.00.)

Statement of the Problem

Considerable lag always exists between the advances resulting from research in the area of drug therapy and the application of these advances to clinical therapeutic utility. While such lag occurs to some extent in large urban medical centers, it is usually even greater in rural areas and in poverty depressed districts of urban areas having a high population-to-physician ratio. In many instances the earliest critical assessments of the clinical therapeutic value and the mechanisms of action of pharmacological agents are made in medical schools and teaching hospitals. As these assessments are always undertaken in the frame of reference provided by the experience with older drugs, it follows that any new, useful pharmacological agent in a given area of therapeutics almost always represents a pharmacological therapeutic alternative to older agents in the same area. It is felt that exposing the practicing physician from rural areas and from urban districts with high population-physician ratio to the early evaluation of pharmacological therapeutic alternatives made routinely and critically in a medical school would be of great value to the improvement of patient care in the communities in which these physicians serve.

Program Objectives

Objectives of the institute can be listed as follows: (1) to provide physicians from rural and poverty depressed urban districts with information on new advances in drug therapy and drug research; (2) to increase the ability of these physicians critically to assess the comparative value of drug agents with older drugs; (3) to stimulate awareness on the part of these physicians for the value to be found in continuing critical assessment and reevaluation of drug therapy; (4) to provide these physicians with instruction dealing with the proper therapeutic application of new procedures employing pharmacological agents; and (5) to elevate the level of patient care among the poverty depressed patients served by these physicians through a process involving reduction in the lag-time between achievement of a pharmacological advance and its proper use in the management of the illnesses of these patients.

Program Activities

The FY 1967 Proposal Number Nine and the FY 1966 Proposal Number Fifteen are, from the viewpoint of Meharry Medical College based on practical knowledge

of the type of program which the institute represents, one proposal. The State Agency accepted this viewpoint and approved this stipulation as a condition of Meharry Medical College's acceptance of FY 1966 funds. It took one year of planning and promotion in order to conduct successfully such an institute. Conduct of the institute was impossible under the exigencies of time limitations imposed by the amount of funds available in FY 1966.

The three-day institute was conducted at Meharry Medical College on May 16-18, 1967. There were twenty-seven practicing physicians in attendance. The panel presentations at this institute on pharmacological therapeutic alternatives included the following topics: (1) orientation; (2) the management of poisonings; (3) the use of psychopharmacological agents; (4) current concepts associated with the use of antidiabetic agents; (5) the comparative therapeutic pharmacology of agents used in cardiovascular diseases; and (6) a discussion of therapeutic problems presented by institute participants.

The institute met for six hours daily. The core method for presentations during the institute involved lead presentations by the institute lecturers which evolved into general discussions participated in actively by the attendees. Most of the sessions were structured in order to have the first session presentation consist of a resume of the scientific knowledge extant on the group of drugs under consideration, given by a pharmacologist with experience and/or research acumen in the specific drug class area, followed by a presentation of clinical application of the drugs in question rendered by clinicians who are experts in clinical usage of the pharmacological agents germane to the topic of the session. Case history presentations were an integral part of the lectures. Liberal use was made of audiovisual aids (projector slides and wall charts) and "handouts" (pamphlets authored by the lecturers and other authorities, reprints of journal articles, and the like). In most cases the attendee was able to correlate the given slide projection directly with a given section of his "handout" material during the institute lectures. It was rewarding to the Institute planners to observe the high degree of discussion precipitated by the implemented procedural format of the institute. At most sessions this kind of constructive activity ran the session proper into overtime periods and was continued in small groups spontaneously gathered during the daily schedule. Several of the institute lecturers generously lent their participation to these "overtime" sessions.

In the case of most of the session lecture presentations made, the lecturer was able to include pertinent quotations of his or her own clinical or scientific findings available from scholarly work either published or near publication. The fact that every lecturer was currently doing some work in an area of the field on which he or she was lecturing is felt to have greatly contributed to the high degree to which constructive discussion became a part of the sessions. Other activities of the institute which were or will be possible as a result of the active, current involvement of the institute lecturers in their field of endeavor are the following:

1. A demonstration of some phases of his work in the area of tranquilizer mechanism occurring in schizophrenic reaction was performed in the evening, in his laboratory by one of the lecturers. Attendance at this demonstration was not inferred to be "obligatory"; but, none-the-less, it was reasonably well attended;

2. In answer to attendee requests made during several of the small, informal post-scheduled sessions, one of the lecturers has agreed to write a review based on his session subject for one of the state medical journals (this review has already been written and is in press in the journal); and

3. Also in answer to attendee requests annotated bibliographies of given areas covered in the sessions are being prepared by the staff with the cooperation of institute lecturers which will be distributed to the participants by mail as soon as they are prepared. The requests were made in such a manner as to indicate that attendees had been "stimulated" by the sessions to desire greater "indepth" comprehension of the subject matter presented. This is a rewarding impression for the institute planners to come to.

To the best knowledge of the institute planners and coordinator, the project represented by implementation of the institute is unique and innovative in its objectives. The institute program represents the first time that a continuing medical education program has by design and a high degree of implementation geared itself to improving the health care given to poverty depressed persons through increasing the awareness of the physicians who treat such persons to advances in a particular, important section of medical science and therapeutics. The use of a program format consisting of exposure of the attendee to advances in a basic medical science (pharmacology inclusive of toxicology) and the clinical therapeutics derivative from these advances in a given, collated panel is unusual for continuing medical educational efforts, if not indeed innovative. The only other example known is the Cornell University Conferences on Therapy.

Program Status

This program has been completed; upon the receipt of the Final Evaluation Report and upon the receipt and approval of the Final Financial Report, the records for this program can be closed.

Institutional Evaluation

According to the Notice of Activation, this proposal was to be evaluated by analysis of two questionnaires completed by the participants. One was to be given at the institute and another subsequent to it.

The results of Meharry's evaluation of the program are not yet finished. The present status of the program, according to the institutional representative, "is obvious from what has been presented vide supra." The final report will include an evaluation of the complete program.

State Agency Recommendation

Since there has been no formal evaluation of this program, it would be extremely difficult for the State Agency to discern its real effectiveness. From a review of the scope of this program--with its content and its highly competent

staff and consultants--it would appear to the layman that this institute was successful in meeting its stated program objectives. A better judgment, of course, must await the formal evaluation.

The institutional proposal for this institute on pharmacological therapeutic alternatives was undoubtedly the most sophisticated and well developed of all the programs funded for FY 1966 and FY 1967. However, considering the funding for two fiscal years, this proposal has had the highest cost per participant ($800.00) of any program conducted under Title I in Tennessee.

It is hoped that the "mulitplier effect" will prove genuinely to elevate the level of patient care and benefit the patients in rural and poverty depressed urban districts as newer pharmacological therapeutic alternatives are used to reduce the time-lag between the achievement of a pharmacological advance and its proper use in the management of the illness of these patients. Unless the "multiplier effect" can reach down to supply and assure the latest in health care to people in the community, this institute could be critized as making the doctors richer and not really helping to elevate the level of patient care among the poverty depressed patients served by these physicians. The State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that the federal funding of future activities of this type should be conditioned upon the results of the formal evaluation of this program.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER SIXTEEN

Program Identification

"Counseling on Sanitary Environmental Conditions," conducted at Tennessee Technological University by Mr. Norris Nickerson, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering. FY 1966 funding: federal--$2,700.00; non-federal--$900.00; total--$3,600.00.

Statement of the Problem

Throughout this entire Upper Cumberland area, rural dwellers are using the pit privy and water secured from wells, without treatment for either. Polluted drinking water and unsafe disposal techniques result. Urban areas have a need for education in "cleaning up" outlying areas and in the general sanitation of their communities.

Program Objective

The object of this project is to privide an educational program for the rural inhabitants of the Upper Cumberland area dealing with proper methods of general sanitation.

Program Activities

This program remains in the planning stage; to date this project has been unsuccessful in reaching the groups of people who need this service. There are many factors involved in the difficulty of scheduling educational sessions, one of the most important of which is the transportation of the participants in this mountainous area of Middle Tennessee.

Program Status

Since this program was not completed in the time period as originally approved, it has been extended through December 31, 1967.

Institutional Evaluation

Persons attending class sessions on improving environmental conditions will be asked to complete evaluation forms to indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Faculty members who present the program will also write a subjective evaluation of the project.

State Agency Recommendation

This program was designed to meet a real need in the Upper Cumberland area as has been documented in the Statewide Report on The Identification of Community Needs in Tennessee. This proposal could contribute materially to the improvement of sanitary environmental living conditions in this area.

In order for a continuing education and community service program to attain its greatest potentiality in the solution of an identified community problem, there must be early, continuous, and significant participant involvement in the planning of the program. This proposal exemplifies the difficulties encountered where there has apparently been no significant involvement of the participant group in the planning stages. Consultation with the participant group during all phases of the program would appear to be an essential ingredient of every successful Title I program. Before a proposal is submitted to the State Agency, care should be exercised by the participating institution to assure that there is sufficient participant awareness and involvement in planning to determine that a program can be consummated.

Since these are FY 1966 federal funds advanced to Tennessee Technological University in September 1966, the State Agency staff believes that this institution has the obligation to complete the project to the best of its ability, although amendments may be made in consultation with the State Agency staff.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER SEVENTEEN

Program Identification

"Cooperative Continuing Education in Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Nursing Aimed at Community Health" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Ten), conducted at The University of Tennessee Medical Units (Memphis) by Mr. Wallace H. Mayton, Jr., Director of Continuing Education. FY 1966 funding: federal--$15,000.00; non-federal--$5,000.00; total--$20,000.00. FY 1967 funding: federal--$15,000.00; non-federal--$5,000.00; total--$20,000.00. (Total funds for both proposals--$40,000.00.) Cooperating institutions: Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Meharry Medical College, and The University of Tennessee Memorial Research Center and Hospital (Knoxville).

Statement of the Problem

The people of the communities within the State need to receive the best of health care through the use of the latest methods in diagnostic treatment and procedures. Physicians, dentists, pharmacists, and nurses should be reached with the latest information on health problems of urban communities, diseases that are widely prevalent, new advances in mental health, cardiology, oral cancer, home and community nursing techniques, and pharmacological discoveries.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to assure the best and latest health care to people of the community by offering the persons in the professions of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and pharmacy the opportunity to keep abreast of the latest developments in their respective fields; and (2) to assist the community hospitals in offering better service and treatment.

Program Activities

The FY 1966 program has enabled The University of Tennessee Medical Units in Memphis to operate its continuing education program on a Statewide basis. An assistant based at Vanderbilt University in Nashville was employed to act as liason between the program and prospective participants, and to evaluate the needs of each community hospital and physician located in Middle and East Tennessee. He also assists in the planning and organization of the programs in West Tennessee.

To date, only two continuing education courses have been offered under this program. The first was a course in "Clinical Radiology for the General Practitioner" held at The University of Tennessee Memorial Research Center and Hospital in Knoxville. This course was conducted on October 13-15, 1966, with eighteen practicing physicians in attendance. The topics of this course included: (1) diagnostic pulmonary radiology; (2) G. I. roentgenology; (3) hypertension and renal disease; and (4) isotopes. The second was a course in "Basic Clinical Electrocardiography" held at Paris Landing Inn in Buchanan, Tennessee. This

course was conducted on April 19-23, 1967, with thirty-seven practicing physicians and one practicing osteopath in attendance. The topics of this course included: (1) electrical transmission in the heart; (2) recording the ECG; (3) the normal ECG; (4) the arrhythmias I-IV; (5) ventricular hypertrophy; (6) myocardial ischemia and infarction I-IV; (7) pediatric ECG I-II; and (8) vectorcardiography.

A number of courses in Pharmacy, Nursing, Medicine, and Dentistry are planned for the next fiscal year. These courses will be offered in various sections of Tennessee. Through cooperation of local health societies and local community officials, plans have been made to offer forums to the people of the community on health care, such as care of the teeth, cancer, childcare, and so forth. The forums would be presented by the staffs of the sponsoring institutions through the cooperation and assistance of the local members of the health professions. The FY 1967 program will continue similar activities as those listed above.

Program Status

The FY 1966 program began July 1, 1966, and has been extended through December 31, 1967. The FY 1967 program will probably be conducted during the calendar year 1968.

Institutional Evaluation

These continuing education post-graduate courses were evaluated by participants in a two-page questionnaire containing nine questions and by verbal communication. At the present time the State Agency has received no formal report on the results of these participant evaluations.

According to the institution's evaluation, the program is proceeding to meet its overall objective to the health professions in the State; it has been necessary (1) to make the administrations and staffs of selected hospitals in the State aware of the program, and (2) to receive their approval of the use of the facilities of those hospitals for a program in continuing education.

State Agency Recommendation

Without a thoughtful and cogent report of participant evaluation on these continuing education programs, the State Agency could not properly evaluate them; it is almost impossible to assess the true effectiveness these continuing education (or post-graduate) courses have had on meeting the stated program objectives. Unless the "multiplier effect" can reach down to supply and assure the latest in health care to people in the community, these proposals could be criticized as making the doctors richer and not really helping the average Tennessean in obtaining better health care.

These proposals do not really deal with a specific community problem; the only courses conducted to date have been directed entirely to practicing physicians, and not to professionals in the areas of nursing, dentistry, and pharmacy.

The State Agency should be furnished with a good, valid participant and institutional evaluation of these proposals. A complete final evaluation of the FY 1966 program should be submitted to the State Agency prior to or subsequent with the beginning of the FY 1967 program.

After two years of federal funding, with $40,000.00 budgeted for this continuing education program, the coordinated and Statewide framework envisaged by The University of Tennessee Medical Units should be existent. Title I funds in this program have provided "seed money" to finance the broadening of the previous program in continuing education for members of the medical and health professions. Therefore, the State Agency would recommend to the State Advisory Council that no additional funds be granted to The University of Tennessee Medical Units to continue the programs as outlined in these proposals. Future proposals should be aimed toward the solution of specific community problems in the health areas, some of which are mentioned in the Statewide Report on The Identification of Community Needs in Tennessee.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER EIGHTEEN

Program Identification

"Public Dental Health Education by Television," conducted by the Department of Broadcasting Services at the University of Tennessee by Dr. Kenneth D. Wright, Assistant Dean of University Extension. FY 1966 funding: federal--$9,000.00; non-federal--$3,000.00 total--$12,000.00. Cooperating agencies: The University of Tennessee College of Dentistry, WKNO-TV in Memphis, and the Tennessee State Dental Association.

Statement of the Problem

Dental health is a large and growing problem in Tennessee; in rural and urban areas alike there is a widespread incidence of poor dental health.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to make people at home more aware of the various aspects of oral hygiene; and (2) to encourage them to initiate and continue good dental health care at home.

Program Activities

A total of twelve (12) four-and-one-half minute dental health scripts will be written, produced, and broadcast on as many educational and commercial television stations in Tennessee as possible.

Program Status

Consultations with the cooperating agencies have been conducted since August 1966. Completion of the television scripts was firmly scheduled for the last weeks of July 1967. Production of the twelve programs are scheduled during August and September 1967, and field contacts with the television stations will be made in September. The programs are tentatively scheduled for broadcasting during the period from October 1, 1967, through February 28, 1968. Evaluation of the program is scheduled to be completed by March 31, 1968.

Institutional Evaluation

The program will be evaluated in terms of station usage, reports from local dentists, reports from mail or contacts with the broadcasting stations, and letters from viewers requesting free printed materials to be offered; and a thorough professional evaluation will be made by staff of the College of Dentistry at The University of Tennessee.

State Agency Recommendation

Since the State Agency has not received copies of the television scripts and the final report and evaluation of this program, it is not possible at this time to know the impact these television programs might have in attaining the stated objectives. No analysis of the value of this proposal or of its effectiveness (of presentation) and practicality can be presented to the State Advisory Council.

It is hoped that many of these twelve video tapes will be successful enough to ensure further usage of the programs on other ETV and commercial stations across the country. The State Agency staff would recommend and encourage additional use of this innovative method of presenting community service programs.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER NINETEEN

Program Identification

"Activation of Field Staff for Assisting Municipalities in Solving Urban and Suburban Problems," (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Two--"Technical Assistance to Tennessee Municipal Officials"), conducted by the Municipal Technical Advisory Service at The University of Tennessee by Dr. Victor C. Hobday, Executive Director of MTAS. FY 1966 funding: federal--$18,750.00; non-federal--$6,250.00; total--$25,000.00. FY 1967 funding: federal--$30,000.00; non-federal--$10,000.00; total--$40,000.00. (Total funds for both proposals--$65,000.00.) Cooperating agency: Tennessee Municipal League

Statement of the Problem

Municipal officials need technical assistance in operating municipal governments and in solving the many problems involved in such operations.

Program Objective

The purpose of this program is to provide the necessary technical assistance through a field staff, especially in the areas of management, law enforcement, accounting, tax assessment, financial administration, public works, utilities, annexation, suburban fringe problems, and the like.

Program Activities

The Municipal Technical Advisory Service has been in operation since 1949, providing technical assistance to Tennessee municipalities in a number of areas. Prior to inauguration of the Title I program, the staff, located on the Knoxville campus (except one consultant in Nashville, largely committed to serving the Tennessee Municipal League), consisted of five specialist consultants and two generalists. Service was almost entirely on a basis of responding to requests received from municipal officials, and the limitations of serving the State of Tennessee from one location in Knoxville are obvious.

A whole new approach was made possible under the Title I program. The State was divided into six districts, and a generalist was assigned to each district, utilizing the two on the staff and four employed under the Title I program (two in Knoxville, two in Nashville, and two in Memphis). Thus each district consultant serves about fifty cities and towns and can spend much more time in the field familiarizing himself with their problems and giving on-the-spot assistance. This "taking the service to the field" would not have been possible without Title I funds, so these funds do not represent a "general assistance grant" but an entirely new type of program aimed at more intensive and more specific technical assistance.

For the six-months period ending December 31, 1966, MTAS enlarged its staff of consultants throughout the State; however, no statistics of services rendered are available for this period. During the six-month period ending June 30, 1967, the municipal consultants provided technical assistance through field visits, correspondence, telephone communications, and conferences. They made 292 field visits, 29 phone calls were received from officials, and 11 conferences with officials were held in MTAS offices.

Matters discussed included the following (figures in parentheses indicate number of cities if more than one): street improvements (8); utility district encroachment on city's water service area (2); industrial development (4); water system operations (2); public housing (2); water tank leak; annexation (12); park development; utility extension policies; retirement program for city employees; refuse disposal (2); urban renewal (4); financial and budgetary problems (2); delinquent water bills; personnel problems; recreation program (2); federal demonstration cities program; workable program (7); accounting and budget system; municipal sales tax (5); property assessments; charter amendments; ambulance services (3); water system improvements (7); council of local governments (5); bond rating of city; unpaid parking tickets; state maintenance of highway through small town; new legislation on property assessments (2); regulation and taxation of liquor sales; local sales tax (10); state maintenance of highways within city; new water system; training employees (14); benches for streets and parks; retirement plans; forms of municipal government (7); records retention and distribution; financing water and sewer construction; fire insurance rating of city (2); expansion of water system (2); water and sewer improvements (5); streets in new subdivisions; municipal swimming pool; sewer improvements (10); municipal hospital (2); dispute with municipal electric board; pay of city employees; motorbike regulation; personnel administration; handling complaints; maintenance of accounting records; control of solicitors and peddlers; water rates (2); water billing; municipal budget (5); codes enforcement (2); coding for computer operation; dispute with utility district; street cleaning; landfill refuse disposal; housing inspection (2); contracting city boundaries; control of trailers; police operations; special census; industrial park; traffic problems; recruiting city employees (2); housing project; and financing new public buildings.

More intensive research-type assistance was provided on the following matters: procedure for adopting a local sales tax; sale of water to another city; revision of city charter; overtime pay policy; administrative survey of city government; annexation guidance (5); air pollution by cotton gins; extension of sewerage facilities into suburban areas; establishing a city library; civil defense; federal aid for water and sewerage facilities (2); building inspection forms; advice to small community considering incorporation (2); job descriptions; retirement plan for policemen and firemen; drafting ordinances; taxation of beer sales; survey of municipal police and fire policies; federal aid applications (2); survey of elected and appointed city recorders; railroad crossing protection; street maintenance by county; organizational survey; utility extension policy; street improvement plans; ambulance service; fire truck specifications; fire protection outside city; and television cable service.

Program Status

The FY 1966 program was conducted from August 1, 1966, until February 28, 1967. The FY 1967 program extended from March 1, 1967, through July 31, 1967. The records for the FY 1966 proposal have been closed, and the records for FY 1967 proposal will be closed upon receipt and approval of the final reports for this program.

Institutional Evaluation

City governments unquestionably play a major role in the "solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban ar s, . . . (particularly) urban and suburban problems." Considering the wide experience of the federal government and consulting firms in providing technical assistance in many fields, the value of such technical assistance, if competent, should be beyond any question. MTAS has been providing such assistance to Tennessee municipalities since 1950, with strong support from state and municipal officials for several budgetary increases. Operating primarily from one office, on the campus of The University of Tennessee, imposed some limitations because of the geographic extent of the State; so with the available Title I funds it was decided to carry these services to the field through a staff of direct consultants (six districts have been established, with four of the consultants under the Title I program). This has been so favorably received that the Tennessee General Assembly, in its 1967 session, at the request of the Tennessee Municipal League, doubled MTAS appropriation for the 1967-69 biennium to permit further expansion of the staff.

Beginning about mid-February, the four Title I consultants on their field visits have left a one-page questionnaire with key municipal officials, to be mailed by them to the MTAS office at Knoxville. Fifty-eight of these were returned; forty-five checked "has extremely high potential value and is a service urgently needed," and thirteen checked "has reasonable effective value and is a needed service." Many favorable comments were also added to these returns, such as: "This service has been a tremendous help to our city. We hope that it will continue as we use it often. Couldn't do without it." "We consider MTAS extremely valuable to the municipalities. Any expansion that will provide quicker and more complete assistance will be helpful." "I do not see how any small town could operate without this service." "I believe this will prove of real value to all of us." "Dyersburg is long overdue for this service." "MTAS has been very helpful in the development of the City of Rutledge and its program in water and sewer planning and general progress of Rutledge. They have rendered assistance every time requested." "No one has been more helpful to us with our problems than Mr. Herbert Bingham of TML and the Municipal Technical Advisory Service." "I think this will prove the most effective type of service that cities could use." "Cannot operate successfully without it." "It all boils down to this--we didn't know how to appreciate the convenience of having water at all times."

State Agency Recommendation

From a review of the list of services rendered by MTAS through field visits, correspondence, telephone communications, conferences, and more extensive research-type assistance, it is evident that this Statewide program has been successful in attaining the stated program objective. Certainly a similar organization in every state would contribute materially to efforts to improve municipal government administration; and without a doubt, an organization such as MTAS, with its legislative fiat and Statewide competencies, is well qualified to provide the type of assistance envisioned in Title I legislation.

The State Agency recognizes the difficulty in evaluating the true effective impact (in hard dollars and cents) Title I has had on the solution of the problem stated in this proposal. MTAS has obtained the second largest grant from Title I funds, 14 percent, and has provided one of the few programs in Tennessee which is considered to be Statewide. It has the potential for continuing benefits to the communities and to Tennessee in a "multiplier effect."

It is encouraging to note that the value of MTAS is continually recognized by the Tennessee General Assembly through its increasing appropriations for MTAS operations. It is hoped that the present level of operations of MTAS can be maintained and increased when Title I funds are no longer available. The State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that this program be favorably considered for funding in FY 1968.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER TWENTY

Program Identification

"Seminar on Local Government" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Three), conducted at Southwestern at Memphis by Dr. Granville D. Davis, Dean of Continuing Education. FY 1966 funding: federal--$2,250.00; non-federal --$1,070.54; total--$3,320.54. FY 1967 funding: federal--$7,694.05; non-federal--$2,564.69; total--$10,258.74. (Total funds for both proposals--$13,579.28.) Cooperating agency: Brookings Institution, Washington, D. C.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is the need for increased intelligence in the management of urban affairs. The complexity of the urban system demands a wider understanding and use of the new technology on the part of those responsible for urban policy decisions.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to examine the shifts in public policy that are influencing political, business and professional life in Memphis in order that local policy makers will make decisions informed by the latest research; and (2) to help participants determine the technological requirements of conditions confronting the urban and regional system and develop receptive attitudes toward innovation.

Program Activities

A total of four seminars were conducted at Southwestern at Memphis on November 3-4, 1966; February 2-3, 1967; April 27-28, 1967; and May 18-19, 1967. Each seminar had a range of thirty-five to thirty-nine in attendance; a total of 144 participants were enrolled for the four seminars, with some participants attending all four. These participants were members of the power structure of the Memphis area, including attorneys, corporate presidents and vice presidents, city and county commissioners, consultants and directors of city and county boards and commissions, college and university staff members, quarterly court members, and area mayors.

The first seminar was a conference on uses of urban information systems. The topics included: (1) cities as information processing systems--the gathering, storing, and retrieving of information flows concerning the total urban process (the nature of the systems and systems analysis); (2) roles of intelligence systems in the management of urban affairs--impact of science and technology upon the management of the affairs of the city (the public officials, elected and appointed); (3) the organization and design of urban information systems--use of case studies in transportation, health, education, etc.; and (4) uses of urban information systems--in operations, in administration, and in policy formulation.

The second seminar was a conference on the impact of urbanization upon the structure of law. The topics were: (1) the role of the law in rapidly urbanizing areas; (2) new property concepts for urban development; (3) the role of law in the redevelopment of our cities; and (4) impact of urbanization upon traditional land use law.

The third seminar was a conference on metropolitan fiscal policy. The topics were: (1) the strategy for metropolitan fiscal policy--the fiscal implications of metropolitanism; (2) the economic effects of the property tax--its influence upon the cost of housing, land use, and the economic future of the metropolitan region; (3) the use of the public economy to guide growth and development--the tax structure as an instrument of public policy; and (4) metropolitan governmental structure and public expenditures--the implementation of public service.

The fourth seminar was a conference on the utilization of urban technology. The topics were: (1) the next stage of urbanization and technology--the uses of urban experimentation; (2) technology transfer and urban innovation --factors determining the transferability of technological developments; (3) the technological systems concentrating, connecting, and distributing urban development--increasing the technological performance capabilities of the urban system; and (4) establishing the limits of private and public responsibilities for developing a new urban technology--economic and political bases essential to the development of a unique urban technology.

Program Status

All four of these seminars have been completed and the records for these two proposals have been closed.

Institutional Evaluation

Several participants wrote letters expressing their appreciation for the program. A questionnaire containing six questions called for comments from the participants to ascertain their actual impressions of the program. With only one exception the participants stated that they had been greatly helped by the conferences. The one exception felt that he had emerged with more questions than answers and he felt confused by his experience. The others ranged from firm endorsement to enthusiastic praise of the speakers and the discussions and ideas they generated. Here are some of the comments. "Particularly the fiscal policy discussion ought to give tangible results in the foreseeable future." "These conferences are going to have greater impact in the city of Memphis in the near term (next 5-10 years) than any other single thing I know of." "All elected officials should attend these conferences. It might shake their 'conventional wisdom.'" According to the institution's evaluation, these quotations were typical, and not exceptional.

State Agency Recommendation

From the list of topics and comments of the participants, it would appear that these seminars were successful to a major degree in attaining the stated program objectives. The State Agency feels that this was a valuable proposal, effective and practical in its presentation. However, it appears that Southwestern at Memphis relied on outside consultants to an inordinate degree, actually playing the role of coordinator and not contributing enough of its own faculty resources to the conduct of the program. It is recognized that the competency and prestige of the institutional representative was instrumental in obtaining the services of the Brookings Institution for these seminars.

Since this was essentially a pilot program, the State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that programs of this type be conducted in other areas of the State where institutions have the competency and faculty resources. It is also recommended that Southwestern at Memphis be allowed to conduct another series of seminars of this type, subject to the U. S. Office of Education interpretation of regulations relative to institutional capability. Care should be taken to ensure that institutional capabilities are not constituted primarily from outside sources.

FISCAL YEAR 1966 PROPOSAL NUMBER TWENTY-ONE

Program Identification

"Expansion of Law Enforcement Program for Municipal, County, and State Officials" (continued as FY 1967 Proposal Number Four--"Law Enforcement Institute for Municipal, County, and State Officials"), conducted at Memphis State University by Mr. Paul R. Lowry, Director of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research. FY 1966 funding: federal--$5,250.00; non-federal--$2,134.32; total--$7,384.32. FY 1967 funding: federal--$8,100.00; non-federal--$2,700.00; total--$10,800.00. (Total funds for both proposals--$18,184.32.) Cooperating agencies: Memphis City Police Department, Shelby County Sheriff's Department, Memphis Juvenile Court, Shelby County Penal Farm.

Statement of the Problem

Contemporary police problems are due to increasing urbanization, increasing population, and shifting values. Law enforcement officials need to understand and correct police problems both at the adult and at the juvenile levels.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to provide orientations, institutes, and classroom courses for persons who are currently engaged in various activities and agencies of law enforcement or who intend to make some phase of law enforcement their career so as to upgrade the education level of these persons; and (2) to increase their awareness of the many methods and practices of all law enforcement agencies.

Program Activities

For the FY 1966 proposal an institute was conducted at the Armour Center, a training and substation for the Memphis Police Department, on September 27-30, 1966. This institute had 661 participants, including 38 chiefs and assistant chiefs of police, inspectors, sheriffs, deputies and other high ranking law enforcement officials from West Tennessee; 475 patrolmen, lieutenants, detectives, and captains of the Memphis Police Department; 15 deputies from Shelby County Sheriff's Department; 14 employees from the Shelby County Penal Farm; 22 other law enforcement personnel; and 97 students from Memphis State University on a space available basis. This law enforcement training institute was concerned with current problems in law enforcement--the role of higher education. The topics included: (1) metropolitan law enforcement; (2) group control and civil disobedience; (3) judicial limitations on police work; (4) juvenile crisis and law enforcement; and (5) higher education and law enforcement.

For the FY 1967 proposal an institute was conducted at the Armour Center on May 31-June 3, 1967. The State Agency has not been furnished a breakdown on

the total number of institute participants, and no list of names with accompanying affiliation has been submitted to the State Agency. Between 600-700 were expected to attend the institute. This law enforcement training institute was concerned with what lies ahead. The topics included: (1) the sex psychopath; (2) fire arm demonstration; (3) human rights--riot control; (4) crime control--problem of probable cause for arrest; and (5) pre-sentence investigation--sociological analysis of urban disorganization.

Program Status

The FY 1966 program has been completed and the records have been closed. The FY 1967 program as originally approved has been completed; upon receipt and approval of a detailed Final Evaluation Report and a Final Financial Report, the records for this proposal can be closed.

Institutional Evaluation

For the FY 1966 program, questionnaires were reportedly distributed to participants; however, the State Agency has not been furnished any detailed information concerning these questionnaires. According to the institution's evaluation, all reports of the institute and responses on the questionnaires have proved favorable, and this favorable response is also indicated by the twin facts of continued participation and the participant's willingness to attend a similar seminar in the future.

No participant or institutional evaluation has been submitted to the State Agency concerning the FY 1967 proposal.

State Agency Recommendation

Since the State Agency has not been furnished with a satisfactory institutional or participant evaluation of these proposals, it is almost impossible to assess the true effectiveness of these institutes in attaining the stated program objectives.

Care should be taken to ensure that program objectives are designed to aid in the solution of identified community problems; they should not primarily be designed to provide equipment, facilities, and funds for scholarships. These aforementioned objectives cannot be identified community problems, and they do not quality for Title I funds.

Unless a specific community need can be identified and documented in this area with a program designed to aid in the solution of this specific problem, and until a good, valid participant and institutional evaluation of these proposals is made, the State Agency staff would recommend to the State Advisory Council that a broad proposal for these institute-type programs should not be considered for federal funding in the future.

FISCAL YEAR 1967 PROPOSAL NUMBER TWELVE

Program Identification

"Inservice Institute for Principals and Guidance Counselors," conducted at Austin Peay State College by Mr. Earl E. Sexton, Director of Development and Field Services. FY 1967 funding: federal--$792.95; non-federal--$264.32; total--$1,057.27.

Statement of the Problem

The Statewide Report on The Identification of Community Needs in Tennessee indicates a great lack of opportunities for youth in this section of the State. Evidence exists to indicate that more emphasis should be secured in guidance and counseling activities in high schools in the early identification of students in the poverty and low-income groups who possess the potential for education beyond high school.

Program Objectives

The objectives are: (1) to assist guidance counselors in developing an awareness of the lack of youth opportunities and in evolving some organized approach to its solution; and (2) to provide for junior and senior high school principals and guidance counselors, particularly the latter, through an institute to be conducted at Austin Peay State College, orientation and acquaintance with developing programs of identification, encouragement, and advisement of high school students in low socio-economic groups.

Program Activities

The institute is tentatively planned to be held on the Austin Peay State College campus during August 22-24, 1967. The three-day program will consist of six sessions of lecture presentation and discussion of different aspects of the problem of acquainting high school youth with more opportunities in education. Consultants will be secured from the Tennessee State Department of Education, the Department of Education and Psychology at Austin Peay State College, and from other institutions of higher education as necessary.

Program Status

This program originally appeared as Proposal Number Thirty-three in the Fiscal Year 1967 Annual Program Amendment. It has been redesignated as FY 1967 Proposal Number Twelve and funded out of excess funds remaining upon completion of FY 1967 Proposal Number Three conducted by Southwestern at Memphis. This new program was approved June 21, 1967, and its budget was approved on July 7, 1967.

Institutional Evaluation

Evaluation will be conducted by institute participants and by the staff of the Department of Education and Psychology and the Division of Field Services at Austin Peay State College.

State Agency Recommendation

This program has just been approved for funding and attempts to aid in the solution of a problem identified in the Statewide Report on The Identification of Community Needs in Tennessee.

INDEX

SECTION	PAGE
Introduction	1
FY 1966 Proposal Number One	6
FY 1966 Proposal Number Two (FY 1967 Proposal Number One)	9
FY 1966 Proposal Number Three	14
FY 1966 Proposal Number Four (FY 1967 Proposal Number Five)	16
FY 1966 Proposal Number Five	19
FY 1966 Proposal Number Six	22
FY 1966 Proposal Number Seven (FY 1967 Proposal Number Six)	25
FY 1966 Proposal Number Eight	27
FY 1966 Proposal Number Nine (FY 1967 Proposal Number Seven)	29
FY 1966 Proposal Number Ten (FY 1967 Proposal Number Eight)	32
FY 1966 Proposal Number Eleven	35
FY 1966 Proposal Number Twelve	38
FY 1966 Proposal Number Thirteen	40
FY 1966 Proposal Number Fourteen (FY 1967 Proposal Number Eleven)	42
FY 1966 Proposal Number Fifteen (FY 1967 Proposal Number Nine)	46
FY 1966 Proposal Number Sixteen	50
FY 1966 Proposal Number Seventeen (FY 1967 Proposal Number Ten)	52
FY 1966 Proposal Number Eighteen	55
FY 1966 Proposal Number Nineteen (FY 1967 Proposal Number Two)	57
FY 1966 Proposal Number Twenty (FY 1967 Proposal Number Three)	61
FY 1966 Proposal Number Twenty-one (FY 1967 Proposal Number Four)	64
FY 1967 Proposal Number Twelve	66

THE LIBRARY OF
OCT 26 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION